
Advertisment.

T Here is now in the Press, and will be
Published by Michaelmas next, [An
Enquiry into the *New Opinions* (chiefly)
propagated by the *Presbyterians* in Scot-
land. By A. M. D. D.]

Advocate

How is now in the U.S. and will be
Published by the U.S. Government
Engineering and the Division (Civil)
Proposed by the U.S. Government
June 26, 1957

2

A
VINDICATION
OF A
DISCOURSE

ENTITLED

The *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*,

With regard to

Episcopal *POWER* and *JURISDICTION*:

Being a Reply

*To Gilbert Rule's Cyprianic Bishop Examin'd and
found not to be a Diocesan.*

WHEREIN

Besides a great many Things more briefly Considered,
The usefulness of fixing the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*
is succinctly Represented; The main Controversie between
those of the Church and the Presbyterians is fully and di-
stinctly stated; Mr. *Rule's* main Subterfuges are utterly over-
thrown; Large Supplements are added to the Principles of the
Cyprianic Age; The *Cyprianic* Episcopacy is shewn to be incon-
sistent with a Papacy; And it is Demonstrated that Episco-
pal Government was universally delivered to be of *Divine Right*
in the Days of *St. Cyprian*.

Οὗς δὲ ἐπισκοπεῖν — Tit. I. II.

L O N D O N:

Printed by *G. Croom* for *Robert Clavel* at the Peacock at the
West end of *St. Pauls*, and *George Strahan* at the Golden-
Ball overagainst the *Royal Exchange*. MDCCI.



THE P R E F A C E.

THO' the Author be a *Scots-man*, yet the Subject is *English*, that is *Episcopacy*; which is but one in all the World, *cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*; of which every *Bishop* holds the whole Power in *Partnership*, or in *Common* with all the rest his fellow *Bishops* of the whole *Catholick Church*.

Here are the *dying Groans* of *Episcopacy* in *Scotland*, which like *Sampson* Triumphs in his Death, and flew more of the *Philistines* than in all his Life, besides shaking the Temple of their *Dagon* to pieces, and burying them, with himself, in its Ruins.

If we cannot help to Restore *Episcopacy* in *Scotland*, are we forbidden to *Pity* it too?

But why do I name *Scotland*? Is it not our own Case as much as theirs? Is *Episcopacy* any more *Jure Divino* Here than it is There? Is it out of the reach of an *Act* of *Parliament* to abolish it Here, as has been done There?

In the Reign of King *Charles II*, when the *Archbishop* of *Glasgow*, *Dr. Burnet*, was thrust out by the *Assertory Act*, An, 1669. the *Archbishop*, and other *Bishops* of *England*, espoused it as their own Cause; nor did they leave it till they had the *Archbishop* restor'd. They considered *Proximus Ucalegon*—— and when their Neighbour's House was on Fire, to look to their own. *Episcopacy* is one College, and if any Apartment, tho' at the utmost corner, be in *Flames*, if no Care be taken, the Rest will soon share the same Fate.

And

The P R E F A C E.

And did the *Bishops* of *England* then shew so much *Zeal*, so much *Concern* and *Foresight*, in the Case of one *Bishop* in *Scotland*; and now, when not only a few, but all the *Bishops* in *Scotland*, not only all the *Bishops*, but *Episcopacy* it self is *Deprived*, by the name of an *unsupportable Grievance*, as it is *Branded* in their *Act of Abolition*; and all this for no *Crime* at all charg'd upon these *Bishops* but that of *Episcopacy*; for they went not out there upon the *Oaths*, they were deprived before the *New Oaths* were imposed there. And is ther not one, no not one to be found in *England* that sees any *Danger* in this, that will open his Mouth, or dare even to Pray (but in private) for the restoring of *Episcopacy* in *Scotland*?

If the Objection be the *Inclinations* of the *People*, and that they will not have it otherwise. The *Episcopal* Party there desire that this may be put to the Test, by letting the *Immediate sense* of the *Nation* be known in a *free Election* of their *Representatives* in *Parliament*, which they have not had since this *Revolution*. And tho' many and pressing *Instances* have been made for a *Free Election* in that *Country*, as has been granted to *England*; yet can it not be obtain'd. The *Presbyterian* Party have Interest to render all these Attempts ineffectual. Well-knowing, at least fearing, that a *Free Parliament* there would shew the *Inclinations* of the *People* to be far otherwise than they have *Represented* them.

Let me tell you withal, That by the *Constitution* in *Scotland*, it was impossible to have turn'd the *Bishops* there out of the *Parliament*, without their own Consent. For nothing could be offered to the *Parliament* but what had first passed the *Lords of the Articles*, and had their Approbation. These *Lords of the Articles* consisted of such a number of the *Bishops*, the *Lay-Lords*, and *Commons*. The *Bishops* not only chose those of their own *Body*, but of the *Lay-Lords* likewise; then they both chose whom they thought fit out of the third *Estate* of the *Commons*; so that the Ballance of the Choice of the *Lords of the Articles* was in the Hands of the *Bishops*: Therefore they could

The P R E F A C E.

could never have been Reach'd upon the Foot of the *Constitution*. But the *Instructions* from *Court-Hall*, 1689. (Printed here by Authority) enabled that *Convention* to turn themselves into a *Parliament*, having first turned out the *Bishops*. There was no other way of coming at them, for they sat in the *Convention* before this, which cou'd not otherwise have been call'd *A Meeting of the Estates* (that was the Name they gave to themselves) of which the *Bishops* were the *First*.

We must not say, That the *Church of England Interest* is less than theirs at *Court*. But it does not yet appear whether it has been Try'd? And if an *English Convocation* can Sit and Part without taking any notice of the Case of *Episcopacy* in *Scotland*, it may be thought, That they have *Forgot*, or are *Unconcern'd*, or waite a better Opportunity.

If it be said, What can they do? They know that better than I can direct them. A willing Mind will find out many ways; I have no skill of *Addresses* to *Court*.

But this they may do, do something like what the *Presbyterian Preachers* do now in *Scotland*; they *Pray* publicly for the *Conversion* of *England* from their *Superstition* and *Idolatry*, meaning our *Episcopacy* and *Liturgy*; and hope once more to send their *Covenant* for a *Text* to us.

Wou'd we had their *Zeal*, or they our *Truth*!

I will not presume to say, *What* is to be done; but that *Something* is to be done. If once we set about it, we will find it.

At least, let the following *Treatise* meet with a favourable Reception. It is wrote in Defence of our common Cause; it has Dissected, and Effectually and Learnedly overthrown the Pretences of the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland*; and it is the same here.

The Dissenters in *England* have already begun to Answer the *London Cases* against them, and have published a Challenge in *Print* to maintain that they are the *True Church of England*. There wants but the *Modish Phrase*, as by *Law Establish'd*; and that they hope for (in the *Stile* of 41) with the assistance of their good *Brethren* of *Scotland*.

Here

The P R E F A C E.

Here is no inconsiderable Aid come to you from thence; who *Single* and without *Armes*; with ill *Health*, few *Books* and less *Leisure*, which his present hard *Circumstances* will not allow him who stands there a *Confessor* and *Champion* for *Episcopacy*, has overcome all these *Difficulties*, by a noble *Christian ZEAL*; which being grafted upon a *clear Reasoning Head*, and *Cultivated* by *Study* and *assiduous Application*, when he can steal a little *Respite* in a *Corner*, from his *Persecutors*, and so much *Time* from his *Sleep* as his *daily Employment* for his *Bread*, denies to him; has routed the *Anti-Episcopal Legion* which possesses his *native Country*, *Baffled* and *Exposed* them to all the *Shame* they are capable of, and driven them into the *Herd of Swine*.

There is a noble *Benefaction* to *Baliol College* in *Oxford* for *Propagating Episcopacy* in *Scotland*. Here is an opportunity offer'd towards that end. If not to *Aid* and *Assist* this *Author*, and protect him from the *violence* of his *Enemies*, for he fears not their *Learning*; yet, at least, to shew some *Countenance* to him, in receiving of his *Book* no otherwise than as it *Deserves*.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 1. l. 15. r. begun. p. 4. l. 29. r. either. p. 7. l. ult. r. three. p. 8. l. 33. r. imply. p. 15. l. 15. r. Ordinations. p. 27. l. 21. r. impos'd. p. 35. l. 5. instead of in r. it. p. 60. l. 10. instead of fairer r. more fierce. p. 70. l. 17. r. DOMINUS. p. 243. Marg. l. 12. r. illicitam. p. 247. Marg. l. 13. r. Confessores. p. 248. Marg. l. 5. dele plura. p. 269. l. 21. r. CHIEFTY. p. 290. Marg. l. 33. r. illicitam. p. 408. l. 33. r. Pontificium.

T H E

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

THE Occasion and Reasons of Collecting *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age.*

The Occasion of Collecting them. § I, II.

The Provocation given by G. R. made it reasonable to Collect them. § III, IV, V, VI, VII

Other Reasons for Collecting them. Particularly

I. *Collected to shew the usefulness of divers Presbyterian Subterfuges.* § VIII, IX.

II. *To shew that our Scottish Presbyterian Authors abuse the People by giving them to Believe that Episcopacy is a late Innovation which prevailed not in the First three Centuries. How earnest our Brethren are in this Matter, proved by Instances from § XI, to § XXVII.*

III. *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age useful for determining the Controversie about the Sentiments of our Reformers concerning Church Government.* § XXVIII, XXIX.

The Cyprianic Age how peculiarly fitted for answering these Ends as being
1. *An Age that afforded no Secular Temptations to aspire to the Episcopal Prebeminence.* § XXX.

2. *An Age of much Ecclesiastical Business.* § XXXI.

3. *An Age of great Men.* § XXXII.

4. *An Age that affords many excellent Records.* § XXXIII.

5. *An Age wherein the extraordinary Manifestations of the Spirit continued to be frequent.* § XXXIV.

6. *An Age so near to the Apostolic Age, as that those who lived in it might have certainly known what Form of Government was left by the Apostles.* § XXXV.

How observable Alterations in Church Government. § XXXVI.

The Christians of the Cyprianic Age bound by Principle to avoid Innovations. § XXXVII.

And

The CONTENTS.

And by Interest. § XXXVIII, XXXIX.

The time between St. John's Death and St. Cyprian's promotion to the See of Carthage, not so long but that such remarkable Events as the alteration of the instituted Form of Government might have been certainly traced. § XL, XLI.

How easie it was then to have traced them, if there had been any such Alterations. § XLII, XLIII.

Even by Oral Tradition, § XLIV, XLV, XLVI, XLVII.

As easie to have traced them, as for us to trace the Alterations whether in Church or State, since the beginning of the Reformation of Religion in Scotland, § XLVIII, XLIX, L.

G. R. bound to acknowledge the certainty of even Oral Tradition for such a Time, § LI.

The serviceableness of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age being once fixed, for the aforementioned three Ends, § LII, LIII, LIV, LV, LVI, LVII, LVIII.

IV. A fourth Reason for Collecting them, § LIX.

How they came to be Published, § LX, LXI.

Two Escapes in them Corrected, § LXII, LXIII.

C H A P. II.

THIS Vindication, however simply unnecessary, yet in a manner needful for stopping the Mouths of our Presbyterian Adversaries.

This Vindication not simply necessary. Because

I. G. R. has really (tho' unwillingly) acknowledged proper Prelacy to have obtained in St. Cyprian's time, § I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X.

II. More than probable that G. R. had never read St. Cyprian's Works before he wrote his Second Vindication, § XI.

Nay probable, he had not read them when he wrote his Cyprianic Bishop Examined, § XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI.

The Edition of St Cyprian's Works made use of by I S. accounted for, § XVII.

III. G. R. so notoriously Inhuman and Injust to I. S. as to make this Vindication unnecessary, § XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII.

IV. Such a Specimen of G. R's. Abilities at Reasoning as may make this Vindication unnecessary, from § XXIV to XXXVI

V. G. R. has not shewn any such skill in the matter of Books as may make this Vindication necessary. And his Blunders

About Walo Messalinus, § XXXVII.

Ad

The CONTENTS.

- And Cornelius's Epistle to Fabius of Antioch, § XXXVIII*
And Eusebius's History, § XXXIX.
A Specimen of Mr. Forrester's skill in Antiquity, § XL.
G. R.'s. Blunder about Clemens Romanus his first Epistle to the Corinthians, § XLI.
His desperate attempt on St. Cyprian's Epistles, § XLII.
VI. *A Specimen of G. R.'s. skill in recommending Books, Particularly*
Paul Bayn's Diocesans Trial. A brief Account of this Book. And the
Autor proved to have been an Independent, § XLIII, XLIV, XLV.
And to have Manifestly contradicted G. R. § XLVI.
Another Instance in Mr. Peregrin's Letters Patents for Presbytery, and
an Account of this Book from § XLVII to LV.
The Reasons of writing this Vindication, and a Specimen of the Boastings of
Scottish Presbyterians, when their Books are not answered, from § LV to
LXVI.
A brief Scheme of this Vindication § LXVIII, LXIX.
A suit to such as shall incline to Reply to it, § LXX.

C H A P. III.

Episcopacy acknowledged by many Learned Presbyterians to have been in the Church in St. Cyprian's Time.

- The Provocation given by G. R. to insist on this Argument, § I.*
CHAMIER acknowledges proper Prelacy to have been in St. Cyprian's time § II, III, IV.
The Presbyterian Principle, That from the Beginning, Moderators of Presbyteries had a Priority of Dignity, quite routs G. R. § V.
The imputation of Church Domination to Bishops, ridiculous, § VI, VII.
G. R.'s Mistakes about Blondel's Apology represented, § IX.
The Design of Blondel's Apology, &c. § X.
Blondel peremptory for Constant Moderators from the Beginning, § XI.
His account of the manner of their Succession, § XII.
How this subservient to his main Design, § XIII.
Blondel Questions not the Lawfulness of Episcopacy, § XIV, XV.
He acknowledges Imparity from the Beginning, § XVI, XVII.
G. R. has miserably mistaken some Passages in Blondel, § XVIII.
Blondel's ample Concessions of Episcopacy in St. Cyprian's time, § XIX,
XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV.
SALMASIUS his Concessions of Episcopacy in St. Cyprian's time, XXV,
 XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII.

The CONTENTS.

- G. R.'s. *Mistakes about* Salmasius, § XXXIII.
Probably Principles were concerted between Blondel *and* Salmasius, § XXXIV.
The Concessions of the Provincial Assembly of London, § XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII.
The Concessions of Fredericus Spanhemius, § XXXVIII.
J. S. did no Injustice to Spanhemius, § XXXIX, XL, XLI.
A Transition to other Authors, § XLII.
Calvin's fair Concessions of Episcopacy in St. Cyprian's time, § XLIII.
Beza's, § XLIV.
Antonius Sadeel's Concessions, § XLV.
Franciscus Junius's, § XLVI.
The Concessions of the Centuriators of Magdeburg, § XLVII.
Of Gersom Bucer, § XLVIII.
Of Petrus Molinæus, § XLIX.
Of Paul Bayn, § L.
Of Mr. Peregrin, § LI.
Of Joannes Henricus Alstedius, § LII.
Of Andreas Rivetus, § LIII.
Of Smeectymnus, § LIV.
Of the Publishers of the English Annotations, § LV.
Of the Divines at Newport in the Isle of Wight, § LVI.
Of Ludovicus Capellus, § LVII.
Of Moyſes Amyraldus, § LVIII.
Of Albertinus, § LIX.
Of Samuel Bochartus, § LX.
Of Joannes Hoornbeek, § LXI.
Of Joannes Dallæus, § LXII.
Of the Anonymous Author of the Observations on Dr. Pearson's Vindication of Ignatius's Epistles, &c. § LXIII.
Of Franciscus Turretinus, § LXIV.
Of Melchior Leideckerus, § LXV, LXVI, LXVII.
Of the Author of the Case of Accommodation, § LXVIII.
Of other XXXIX Presbyterian Authors Referred to, § LXIX.
All the true Disciples of Beza, Blondel, Salmasius, &c. *Bound to own Episcopacy to have been in St. Cyprian's time,* § LXXI.
And all the Disciples of St. Jerom, LXXII.
And all who make Prelacy the Mystery of Iniquity, § LXXIII.
It must be a real Majority of Power, and not of bare Dignity, that must be acknowledged by all the abovementioned Authors, § LXXIV.
Constant Moderators from the Beginning, acknowledged by the learnedest of the abovemention'd Authors. *ibid.*

The CONTENTS.

The force of this Argument taken from the Concessions of Learned Presbyterians, and how irresistibly it concludes against G. R. § LXXV, LXXVI, LXXVII.

CHAP. IV.

THE true State of the main Controversie between us and the Presbyterians fixed; and thereby the unserviceableness of one of G. R.'s. main Subterfuges fully represented.

The Subterfuge is that such an Argument or Authority, doth not infer that in St. Cyprian's time the Bishops had the SOLE POWER of Ordination and Jurisdiction, § I.

This Subterfuge industriously excluded by J. S. in the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, § II.

G. R. very angry at J. S.'s. (and no wonder, considering how much depends on the true State of it) stating of the main Controversie, § III, IV.

G. R. Attacks J. S.'s. state of the main Controversie four ways, § V.

I. He (in vain) would have J. S.'s. Distinctions useless and unapplicable, § VI, VII, VIII, IX.

II. He (unsuccessfully) would have J. S.'s. State of the main Controversie inconsistent with the main Design of his Book, § X, XI.

III. He attempts, (as unsuccessfully) to shew that J. S.'s. State of the main Controversie is inconsistent with the Canons and Constitutions of the Church of Scotland, § XII, XIII, XIV.

IV. He says, J. S. is singular in his stating of it, § XV.

J. S. not singular in it, even by Mr. Forrester's acknowledgment, § XVI, XVII, XVIII.

How surprizingly Mr. Forrester States the main Controversie, § XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII.

J. S. not singular in his State of the main Controversie, by G. R.'s. own acknowledgment, § XXIV, XXV.

Prelatic Authors generally agree with J. S. in his stating of the main Controversie. Both Scottish and English. Particularly.

King James the Sixth, § XXVII.

Bishop Cowper, § XXVIII.

Peter Hay Gentleman of North Brittain, § XXIX.

Archbishop Spotswood, § XXX.

Dr. Lindesay Bishop of Brechin, § XXXI.

Dr.

The CONTENTS.

- Dr. John Forbes of Corfs, § XXXII.*
The Doctors of Aberdeen, § XXXIII.
The Bishops in their Declinature An. 1638. § XXXIV.
Dr. Maxwell Bishop of Ross, and afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, § XXXV.
King Charles the First, § XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII.
Andrew Logie Archdeacon of Aberdeen, § XXXIX.
The Author of the Seasonable Case, An. 1662. XL.
Honyman Bishop of Orkney, § XLI.
Lighton Bishop of Dumblane, § XLII.
Gilbert Burnet Professor of Divinity in Glasgow, § XLIII.
The Author of The Reformed Bishop, § XLIV.
The Author of The Differences of the Times, § XLV.
A. C. M. A. in his Essay concerning Church Government, § XLVI.
The Author of the Ten Questions, &c. XLVII.
Doctor Monro, § XLVIII.
A Recapitulation, § XLIX.
A Transition to English Authors, § L.
Archbishop Whitgift, § LI.
The great Hooker, § LII.
Sutlivius, § LIII.
Bishop Downam, § LIV, LV. Even by the Concessions of A. Melvin and D. Calderwood; and Mr. Forrester Chastiz'd, § LVI.
Bishop Bilson, even by the Concessions of A. Melvin and D. Calderwood, § LVII.
Bishop Morton, § LVIII.
Doctor Field, § LVIX.
Bishop Andrew's, § LX.
Bishop Davenant, § LXI.
Mr. Chillingworth and a great Party with him, § LXII.
Archbishop Usher. § LXIII.
Doctor Holdsworth, § LXIV.
Bishop Hall, § LXV, LVI, LVII.
Mr. Baylies Adversary, by Baylies own Confession, § LXVIII.
The Author of the Book Entitled, Velitationes Polemicæ, § LXIX.
The Learned Mr. Thorndike, LXX.
The Author of the Brief Account of Ancient Church Government, § LXXI.
Dr. Isaac Barrow, § LXXII.
Dr. Stillingfleet, § LXXIII.
Dr. Sherlock, § LXXIV.
Dr. Parker Bishop of Oxford, § LXXV.
Dr. Pearson Bishop of Chester, § LXXVI.

Order

The CONTENTS.

Other XXIV English Authors, § LXXVII.
Antonius de Dominis, § LXXIX.
Bishop Taylour, § LXXX.
Doctor Hammond, § LXXXI, &c.
Mr. Dodwell, § LXXXVIII, LXXXIX.
An Advice to G. R. concerning Mr. Dodwell, § XC.
A Recapitulation, § XCI.
The SOLE POWER of Ordination not allowed to Scottish Bishops by the Constitution, § XCIII, XCIV.
Nor the SOLE Power of Jurisdiction, § XCV, XCVI, XCVII, XCVIII.
Neither allowed them by the Practice of the Scottish Government, § XCIX.
SOLE POWER not allowed to either English or Irish Bishops, by the Constitutions of these Churches, § C, CI.
Parity or Imparity, &c. The true state of the Controversie, § CII.
So 'tis stated by many Presbyterian Authors, § CIII, particularly By Mr. Baylie, § CIV.
By another Scottish Author, § CV.
By the Author of the Case of Accommodation, &c. § CVI.
By Mr. William Jameson, § CVII.
By Mr. Thomas Forrester, § CVIII.
By G. R. himself, § CIX, CX.
Parity and Imparity must be the State of the main Controversie, by the Tendency of the Presbyterian Arguments, § CXI.
And by the Tendency of the Prelatic Arguments, § CXII, CXIII, CXIV.
And by the Simile's insisted on by the Prelatists, § CXV.
The Chapter concluded, § CXVI.

C H A P. V.

G. R's second main Subterfuge Attack'd, first by producing a Specimen of the *Terms and Phrases* which do frequently occur in the Monuments of the *Cyprianic Age*; and do necessarily import a *Majority of Power* as well as *Dignity* lodg'd in the Persons of Bishops as contradistinct from Presbyters.

The Subterfuge stated, and how frequently retreated to by G. R. § I, II.
Most Ridiculously in the Cases of Tertullian and St. Austin, § III.
This Subterfuge briefly subverted, § IV, V, VI, VII.

The CONTENTS.

A more full subversion of it proposed, as a Supplement to the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, § VIII.

The Method laid down, § IX.

I. Episcopal Honour, in the Cyprianic Stile, imports Power, § X.

A gross Instance of G. R's disingenuity exposed, § XI, XII, XIII.

II. Episcopal Dignity, in the Cyprianic Stile, imports Power, § XIV.

III. The Term Consilium, in the Cyprianic Stile, imports Power, § XV.

The true sense of the Phrase [Limare Consilium] Established, and Episcopal Superiority in the Person of St. Cyprian Demonstrated, § XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII.

IV. Episcopal Providence imports Power, § XXIV.

V. Episcopal Authority another Cyprianic Term, § XXV.

VI. Episcopal or Sacerdotal Power, § XXVI.

VII. Honour and Authority in Conjunction, § XXVII.

VIII. Honour and Power in Conjunction, § XXVIII.

IX. Power and Authority in Conjunction, § XXIX.

X. Many Phrases importing Power, enumerated, § XXX.

An Improvement of the preceding Observations, § XXXI.

XI. The Episcopal Actus explain'd, § XXXII.

XII. Episcopal Discipline considered, § XXXIII.

XIII. Episcopal Vigor, § XXXIV, XXXV.

XIV. The Episcopal Tribunitian Power, § XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII.

XV. The Episcopal Cenforian Power, § XXXIX.

XVI. The Episcopal Licentia or Absolute Power, § XL, XLI, XLII, XLIII, XLIV.

XVII. The Episcopal Liberum Arbitrium, § XLV.

An Improvement, § XLVI.

A Transition to the next Chapter, § XLVII.

C H A P. VI.

G R's second main Subterfuge overthrown by Producing a Specimen of Prerogatives lodg'd in the Bishops Person in the Days of St. Cyprian.

A brief Introduction, § I.

I. By the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, Bishops Successors to the Apostles in the Supreme Power Ecclesiastica', § II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII.

II. Promoted by singular Succession, § XIV, XV, XVI, XVII.

III.

The CONTENTS.

- III. *Made a College distinct from Presbyters*, § XVIII, XIX.
A Recapitulation, and the Concessions of Chamier, Blondel and Salma-
sius, § XX, XXI.
- IV. *The Bishops Locus and Gradus*, § XXII, XXIII.
- V. *His Cathedra or Chair*, § XXIV, XXV, XXVI.
Divers other Prerogatives named, § XXVII.
- VI. *The Bishop Præpositus to Presbyters*, § XXVIII, XXIX, XXX.
- VII. *He was Gubernator or Steersman*, § XXXI.
- VIII. *He held the Ballance of Government*, § XXXII.
- IX. *He was the High Priest*, § XXXIII, XXXIV.
The Sacerdotii Sublime fastigium, what, § XXXV.
- X. *He was Pastor in Chief*, § XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX,
 XL.
- XI. *He was the one Judge*, § XLI, XLII, XLIII, XLIV, XLV.
- XII. *He was the same to his Diocese that a King is to the Kingdom*,
 § XLVI.
No absurdity in ascribing Majesty to a Bishop, § XLVII, XLVIII, XLIX,
 L, LI,
However more Prerogatives adducible, § LII, *yet only one farther insisted*
on, namely.
- XIII. *A Bishop in St. Cyprian's time had the Supreme Power of the Sa-*
craments. Instanced in Baptism, § LIII.
- Tertullian's Testimony concludes it Effectually*, § LIV.
- Ignatius's Testimony concludes it effectually. And G. R's. surprizing attempt*
to make Ignatius a Presbyterian, § LV.
- St. Cyprian's Testimony concludes it effectually. And G. R's. surprizing Eva-*
sions exposed, § LVI, LVII, LVIII, LIX, LX.
- Fortunatu's a Thucabori's Testimony concludes it*, § LXI.
- Firmilian's Testimony concludes it*, § LXII.
- The Bishops Sovereign Power of Baptism follows necessarily from many of*
the abovemention'd and asserted Prerogatives, § LXIII, LXIV, LXV.
- Another Testimony of St. Cyprian's concludes it*, § LXVI.
- The Bishops Sovereign Power of Baptism inferred from the Testimonies of*
other 14 of St Cyprian's Contemporaries, LXVII, LXVIII, LXIX, LXX.
- Proved farther from this, that none but Bishops could determine Controversies and*
Cases about Baptism, § LXXI.
- The Testimony of Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria (one of St. Cyprian's*
Contemporaries proves it irresistibly, § LXXII.
- It is evident from the whole management of the grand Controversie concerning*
Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, § LXXIII.
- The true state of that Controversie*, § LXXIV.
- The Bishops Sovereign Power of Baptism supposed by both Stephanians and*
Cypri-

The CONTENTS.

- Cyprianists in the State of the Controversie, § LXXV, LXXVI, LXXVII.
- It is supposed in the chief Argument insisted on by the Stephanians, § LXXVIII.*
- It is inferred from VII Arguments insisted on by the Cyprianists, § LXXIX, LXXX.*
- It is inferred from a ninth Argument of theirs, viz. that the Bishop had as much the Sovereign Power of Baptism as of Confirmation, § LXXXI.*
- G. R.'s vain attempt to deprive the Cyprianic Bishop of the Sovereign Power of Ordination, § LXXXII.*
- A Bishop in St. Cyprian's time had as much the Sovereign Power of Baptism as of Confirmation, § LXXXIII.*
- G. R.'s surprizing Notions about Confirmation exposed, § LXXXIV, LXXXV, LXXXVI, LXXXVII.*
- The Cyprianic Notion of Confirmation, § LXXXVIII.*
- St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries held Baptism and Confirmation to be two distinct Sacraments, § LXXXIX.*
- Depending on Distinct Institutions, § XC.*
- Producing distinct Operations, § XCI, XCII.*
- Capable of Contradictory Predicates, the one being Iterable and the other not, § XCIII.*
- The One so far from being an Appendage of the other, that many Years might have interven'd between them, XCIV.*
- Confirmation as much design'd for conferring the Ordinary as the Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, § XCV.*
- A Recapitulation and Transition, XCVI.*
- The Bishop, the Minister of Confirmation, XCVII.*
- St. Cyprian's Testimony acknowledged by Blondel and Daillé to prove it, § XCVIII, XCIX, C, CI, CII.*
- The Bishops Sovereign Power of Baptism thence inferred, § CIII.*
- Firmilian makes the Bishop the Minister of Confirmation, § CIV, CV.*
- So doth Cornelius, § CVI, CVII.*
- As is acknowledged by Blondel, Salmasius, and Daillé, CVIII, CIX, CX.*
- The same proved by other Arguments, § CXI.*
- The Bishops Sovereign Power of Baptism Demonstrated from one of the most remarkable Results of the Controversie about Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, § CXII, CXIII.*

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. VII.

G. R's second main Subterfuge finally overthrown by a Representation of the Bishops Sovereign Interest in some of the most eminent Acts of Government.

The Method proposed, § I, II.

By the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, the Bishop, by himself could give Laws to his Diocese, § III.

This proved from divers Cyprianic Principles, § IV.

Proved from St. Cyprian's Practice, § V, VI.

Proved from divers Prerogatives accounted for Chap. VI. § VII.

Proved from these Words, Quando a primordio Episcopatus &c. § VIII, IX.

St. Cyprian, &c. did Ordinarily Act with the consent of Presbyters, § X.

But with a Negative over them, § XI.

The Scottish Constitution agreeable to the Cyprianic Principles, § XII.

Bishops alone defined in Provincial Councils, § XIII.

This proved by an Induction of Canons, &c. § XIV.

Proved more particularly from the Synodical Decrees concerning the Lapsers, § XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII.

And from the Constitution of the Synods Convocated to determine in the grand Controversie concerning Heretical Baptisms, XIX.

Particularly of the great Synod of Carthage, An. 256 § XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII.

Objections stated, § XXIV.

General Answers, § XXV, XXVI.

Particular Answers, § XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX.

Presbyters had no more Power than the People in Synods, § XXX, XXXI, XXXII.

The People had not Definitive Voices in Synods, § XXXIII.

The People had not an Elective Voices in the promotion of Bishops, § XXXIV.

Suffragium Plebis, not an Elective Voice, § XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII.

Popular Elections not favoured by these Words, quando Plebs maxime habeat potestatem Eligendi Dignos, &c. § XXXIX.

Arguments proving that the People had not an Elective Suffrage, &c. § LX, LXI, LXII.

By Consequence, not Definitive Voices in Synods, § XLIII.

The People, even in the Cyprianic Age, Incapable of having a Definitive Voice in Synods, § XLIV.

Whatever Interest the People had, it was common to the Plebs universa, or to all the People, § XLV, XLVI, XLVII.

The CONTENTS.

By Consequence, the People had not Definitive Voices, &c. XLVIII.
The People had not Definitive Voices in particular Churches, § XLIX.
Not in Rome, no not while the See vacant, § L, LI, LII.
Much less when filled, § LIII.
Not in Carthage while Cyprian in his Retirement, § LIV.
Much less while in the City, § LV, LVI.
Martyrs and Confessors had peculiar Prerogatives, § LVII.
And were mighty Zealous in the Cause of the Lapsers, § LVIII.
Yet, could do no more but Recommend or Petition, § LIX.
Their Petitions, when displeasing, rejected by the Bishop, § LX, LXI, LXII,
 LXIII, LXIV.
By consequence, none of the People had Definitive Voices, § LXV.
The real Privileges of the People in Synods, LXVI, LXVII, LXVIII.
The true purpose of the Phrase sicut mutuus honor poscit, § LXVII.
Neither all Presbyters nor all Deacons present in Synods, nor otherwise Represented than by their Bishops, § LXIX, LXX.
The Result of the proceeding Discourse concerning the Power of the People, &c. § LXXI.
Canons for the Catholick Church how made, § LXXII.
Of the Bishop's Power of Jurisdiction, § LXXIII.
G. R. chastised and the Chap. concluded with a Syllogism, § LXXIV, LXXV.

C H A P. VIII.

G• R's. third main Subterfuge stated and defeated.
It is that there were Three sorts of Presbyters in St. Cyprian's time.
And the Services for which it is contrived, § I, II, III.
It is unfix'd Presbyters considered, § IV, V.
It is Ruling Elders considered, § VI, VII.
Blondet surprizingly Cited for Ruling Elders, § VIII.
Archbishop Whitgift surprizingly Cited for R. Elders, § IX.
Mr. Thorndike surprizingly Cited for R. Elders, § X.
Origen in vain Cited for R. Elders, § XI.
Tertullian in vain Cited for R. Elders, § XII.
No Vestige of Ruling Elders in the Gestæ Purgationis Cecilianæ & Felicis, nor in Jerom, nor Austin, nor Gregorius Magnus, nor Isidorus Hispalensis, § XIII, XIV, XV.
Whether St. Basil and Optatus, St. Cyprian's Contemporaries ? § XVI.
St. Basil surprizingly adduced for Ruling Elders, § XVII.
Optatus makes nothing for R. Elders, § XVIII, XIX.
Four Arguments ad Homines, viz. G. R. and T. F. against Ruling Elders, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV.

C H A P.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. IX.

NO Countenance given by the Principles of the *Cyprianic* Age to the Papacy.

An Introduction, and G. R.'s first Insinuation, viz. that we lay greater stress on Antiquity than the Scriptures, considered, § I, II.

Every Bishops being the Principle of Unity to his own Church no plea for a Papacy, § III.

Every Bishops being High-Priest, &c. inconsistent with a Papacy, § IV, V.

The Papacy unavoidably excluded by making the College of Bishops the Principle of Unity to the Catholic Church, § VI, VII.

The Presbyterian Plea, That We borrow our Arguments for establishing Episcopacy, from the Papists, proposed, § VIII.

How much insisted on against D. Monro by Mr. Jameson, § IX.

How much, by G. R. § X.

How much, by T. F. in his Hierarchick Bishops Claim, &c. § XI.

The Charge very probably false, § XII, XIII.

Very certainly Senseless, § XIV.

Very monstrously Shameless, § XV, XVI.

The Presbyterian Plea, That Episcopacy introduces a Papacy, proposed, § XVII.

It is a Popish Argument, § XVIII.

Popish Principles as warmly charged by other Sectarians on Presbyterians, as by Presbyterians on Prelatists, § XIX, XX, XXI.

The Answers returned to the Charge by the Presbyterians do every way as much Purge the Prelatists, § XXII, XXIII.

Other Answers to the charge as made against us by the Presbyterians, § XXIV.

Episcopacy Absolv'd from the Scandal of being Introductive of Popery, by a full Jury of Learned Presbyterians, § XXV, XXVI.

The Papists are convinc'd that our principles are inconsistent with a Papacy, § XXVII.

This Chapter a sufficient Vindication of D. Monro's Enquiry into the new Opinions, &c. § XXVIII.

CHAP. X.

EPiscopacy was believed by St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries to be of Divine Right.

The Provocation given by G. R. to prove that this was a Cyprianic Principle, § I. Of how great Consequence it is, if it can be proved to have been a received Principle in that Age, § II.

That

The CONTENTS.

That it was a receiv'd Principle prov'd from divers things already demonstrated. § III.
St. Cyprian believed that Bishops were promoted by Special Divine Designation,
 § IV.

He believed that they were Vindicated and Protected by a Special Divine Providence, § V.

The Consequence of the two preceding Considerations, § VI.

He Believed that God did Honour Bishops with extraordinary Revelations, for their Direction and Encouragement in the Administration of the Episcopal Office, § VII, VIII.

The Consequence of this Consideration, and its peculiar force against Scottish Presbyterians, § IX, X, XI, XII.

He believed Rebellion against, contempt of, Separation from a Bishop, &c. to be Transgressions of the Divine Law, § XIII.

He believed that the Devil had a peculiar Malice against Bishops as being of Divine Institution, § XIV.

He positively and expressly asserts the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, § XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI.

Origen & Dionysius believed the Divine Institution of Episcopacy § XXII, XXIII.

It was universally believed by all the Bishops in Africa, § XXIV, XXV, XXVI.

It was universally believed by all the Christians in Rome, § XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX.

It was believed by Alexander the Bishop and all the Christians of Jerusalem, § XXXI.

Firmilian never declared for Presbyterial Government, § XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV.

He has declared positively for Episcopal Government, § XXXVI.

He himself was a famous Bishop Superiour to many Presbyters, § XXXVI, XXXVIII.

He has declared plainly for Divine Right of Episcopacy, § XXXIX, XL.

Pontius no Declarer for Presbyterial Government, § XLI, XLII, XLIII.

Pontius clearly makes St. Cyprian to have been first a Presbyter, and after that a Bishop, § XLIV, XLV, XLVI, XLVII, XLVIII, XLIX, L, LI, LII, LIII.

Pontius believed the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, § LIV.

A Recapitulation of the Evidences of the universal Reception of Episcopacy as of Divine Right in the Cyprianic Age, § LV.

No Age more zealous against Innovations or Recessions from Divine Institutions, than the Cyprianic, § LVI.

Particularly, in the Constitution and Government of Churches, § LVII.

The Tendency of this Work, and its Conclusion, § LVIII, LIX.

A
VINDICATION
 OF A
DISCOURSE,

ENTITLED

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

CHAP. I.



The Occasion and Reasons of Collecting those Principles.

SOME Years ago, some Sheets of mine had the luck to be published under the Title of *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, with regard to Episcopal Power, and Jurisdiction*. Some Months thereafter, They had an Answer bearing the Name of *The Cyprianic Bishop Examined, and found not to be a Diocesan*, Written by Gilbert Rule, one of the Ministers of the City, (as he calls himself) and Principal of the College of Edinburgh. Much about the time of the Publication of his Book, my Circumstances turn'd to be such as did not allow me, till very lately, to Consider it Seriously. And now that I am to Defend those Principles, I hold it not improper in the first place, to account for my Collecting of them, and that for two reasons. One is, that, as I have been told, some who did not Condemn my Book did however wish that I had not began it so abruptly, but had ushered in the Controversy manag'd in it, with some Preface, giving an account of the Occasion and Reasons of Writing it. The

§ I.

C

other

The principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

other, That G. R. may know that however his *Rashness* might have been the *First*, yet it was neither the *Only* nor the *Chief* incitement that mov'd me to Write it. The Occasion was this.

§ II.

THE *Scottish* Episcopal Clergy, as all *Britain* knows, had met with some *Rigours* (to give them no harder names) in the beginning of the *late Revolution*. Some of them therefore, thinking it fit to let it be known, that they were not altogether insensible of those *Usages*, had Published some short Accounts of them. Hence, a *Paper War* was Commenced; and G. R. was imployed by a *General Assembly* of his Brethren, to be their *Champion*, and to try if he could (if not justify the Methods of his Party, yet, at least) Extenuate and Soften the *Noises* which had been rais'd against them. Hereupon he Published his *Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland*. Shortly after that, there appear'd *An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland*, wherein G. R. was not more roundly than jultly Chastised.

§ III.

G. R. has all along been a Man of such Metal as cannot well bear with the humblest Contradiction; much less with any thing that looks like Daring of him: Wherefore he did again Gird on his Armour, and in one continued *Huff*, Wrote *A Defence of the Vindication of the Church of Scotland*, in Answer to the aforesaid *Apology*. I had seen all the former Papers; and my Curiosity likewise led me to Read this last, in which, as I expected, so I found divers things apt enough to have Surprized such as were unacquainted with his way of Writing. But for my own part, I was not much moved till I came to pag. 34. § 39. where I found him stoutly denying that there was any such thing as Episcopal Government in St. *Cyprian's* time, and not only Denying it, but fairly pledging his Word, that he would own *himself* and all his Brethren to be *Schismatics*, if it should be proved, that, in that Age, there was such a Government. This I do Confess, did so take with me that I could not but think G. R. deserved to be taken at his Word. And what matter if I (who then had little other business) should for some time imploy my self that way, for my own private Divertisement? This was indeed the first Spring of the Attempt I made. However,

§ IV.

BEING fully Satisfied that it was *Rashness* in G. R. so to have exposed himself, I thought it might be no less, if not more

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

3

more Culpable in me to Chastise *his* with equal Rashness: I Considered therefore if it would be worth my Pains and the While to enter the lists with him: And the only thing that occur'd to me on the Dissuading side, was much that same Series of Thoughts which G. R. has Published, as his main Argument of the unreasonableness of my Attempting to Expose him, *viz.* That Granting I should Defeat him in that point, yet it would not ruin the Cause of Presbyterians; it would amount to no more than that one Presbyterian did mistake in a matter of Fact, as it is related in the Ancient History. (a) The Presbyterian Cause did not depend on his Credit: Tho' he should be baffled in the Scuffle, yet his Brethren had all their other Pleas safe and sound enough; and tho' he should be fairly concluded a Schismatick, from his own voluntary Paction; yet his Paction, however Expressed, and however Including his Brethren, as much as he was able to Include them, would not be Sustained, by his Brethren, to be of any more than Personal and private Obligation. But this Reasoning did not give me much trouble; for granting it to be true that G. R. was the only Man who indeed could be concluded, and that his Brethren, not being necessary to his Rashness, could not be affected by its consequences, yet he was a Man of so great Note, had made such a Figure by his Writings, and had so many Eyes upon him, that it could not but be some Service done to that which I do still think a good Cause, to quell the Pride, and thereby, perhaps, soften the temper, if not open the Eyes, of one of its so famous Adversaries.

(a) Cyp. B. Ex. p. 2. §. 2.

NEITHER can I think that G. R. himself, when in cold Blood, can deem it unreasonable to endeavour to expose the weakness or the Rashness of a bitter Advocate; when he is persuaded that that Advocate is pleading a very bad Cause. He cannot be so Unconscientious as still to have thought this unreasonable, and yet withal to have Written so many Books against particular Adversaries. But if to do so be allowable, allowable by G. R.'s own practice, by his practice so probably Regulated by an unreluctant Conscience; then, methinks, he might, without injustice to either his Reputation or his Book, have very well spared to tell his Readers (b) That if my Book was Written only to convince the World that he who Wrote the Defence of the Vindication against the Apologist is not infallible in all that he Asserteth, I might have spared my Pains; that should easily have been yielded to me: Neither can I imagine what a Jumble

§ V.

(b) p. 2. § 2.

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

of Thoughts has been in his Head, when this started out; does he fancy that all the Authors, he has Written against did still look on themselves as *Infallible*? For my Part, as I never doubted of G. R.'s *Fallibility*, so I do assure him, it was not the Discovery of *That*, but of his *Rashness* that I aim'd at. But this is not all.

§ VI.

AS what I have said made it seem to me not unreasonable to take him, tho' considered only as a private Advocate, at such a Disadvantage, so I Considered farther that he was not to be looked on as only a *Private*, but rather as *one* if not the *only* publick, stated, authoriz'd *Advocate* of the Party. He himself has told us somewhere, (c) that he Wrote his *Second Vindication* by publick Order. So long therefore as his *Commission* was not *revok'd*, (which certainly it was not, when he Wrote his *Defence*) it was reasonable to think, he had the same Authority for *Defending*, which he had at first for *Writing* that *Vindication*: And if so, 'tis plain, I had very good reason to look on him as representing the whole Party: But if there was reason for this, it seems farther Plain, that G. R. did neither great *Honour*, nor great *Justice* to the Character of an Authoriz'd *Vindicator*, when he said (d) p. 2. § 2. (d) that *Granting all I Plead'd for, it would amount to no more than that one Presbyterian, and be amongst the meanest of them, did mistake in a matter of Fact, &c.* For however this might have done with another Person, yet it seems not so well to *become a proclaim'd Champion*. But to leave this.

§ VII

HAD it not been for other and weightier reasons than those already mentioned, it is like, neither he nor any other body had ever been troubled with my Book. Indeed it was not G. R. Considered as other *private* or *publick* Advocate, but the following Considerations which finally determined me to make such an attempt. Particularly.

§ VIII.

I. LONG before I saw his *Defence* of his *Second Vindication*, I had observed that the Advocates for Presbytery, especially in their Ventilations of that truly unanswerable Argument, taken from the Constitution and Practice of the Government of the Churches of the first Ages, had invented divers such *Subterfuges* as were apt enough to cheat *less knowing* and *less thinking* People, For instance, How ordinary is it with them, in their Books, to put off the plainest Testimonies of the Ancientest Fathers, with these or the like shifts, That they infer only a *Priority of Dignity*, but not at all of *Power*? Or, they make only for a *Preheminence of Order*, not of *Degree*? Or, they conclude

clude no more than that he, who, in those times was called *Bishop*, was only the *first Presbyter*, or at most, the *constant Moderator* of a *Presbytery*? And when none of these Distinctions are well applicable; the last Refuge is, such Testimonies do not conclude that he had the *sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction*. This I say, is the last Refuge; and so much *Cunning* is easy, as to speak it out *Confidently*, and with such an *air* as may oblige the unwary Disciple to take it for granted, that *sole Power* and *Superiority*, or (as others call it) *Majority of Power* are but different Names for the same thing.

TO adduce Citations to prove that this is their way, is perfectly needless, you cannot read any of their Books but you shall find instances in great plenty. And with such evasions as these, They can readily pretend that they have very well Reconciled their *New Model* of Government with the *Form* of the *Ancient Churches*; which really is to them a matter of no small consequence. For however the more *Incautious* among them may clamour, on all occasions, That they do not value the *Fathers*; That the *Scripture* is the only Judge of Controversies; and that they are not to be concluded by later than *Scripture Antiquity*, &c. Yet the more *Judicious*, unless in great Straits, are very loath to give an open Defiance to the *Primitive Church*. They are not willing (as G. R. himself tell us) (e) to yield that (e) ubi *Supra*. the *Suffrage of later than Apostolick Antiquity* is for their *Adversaries*. Besides this I Considered.

§ IX,

2. THAT as our *Scottish Presbyterians* are generally sonder of such Books as are Written, on this Controversy, by *Scottish Men* of their own *side*, than those that are Written by *Strangers*: (the former being commonly more *keen* and *peremptory* for the *Divine Institution* of *Parity*, and the *unlawfulness* of *Prelacy* than the latter) So I had observed that our *Scottish Presbyterian Authors* had almost unanimously agreed to represent *Episcopal Government* as an *Innovation*, not known to the Churches (at least) of the *first three Centuries*. It may indeed, seem incredible to Men of Sense, especially such as are skill'd in *Antiquity*, That Men who make such mighty pretences to *Truth* and *Ingeniuty*; who pretend to be so *Zealous maintainers* of the *Cause of Christ*, and so irreconcilable Enemies to all false accounts of things, and all groundless *Impositions* on God's People, should so boldly attempt to *Impose* a piece of such notoriously *false History* on their *Disciples*: And therefore I must beg the *Readers Patience* till I have proved that I am not injurious

§ X.

to

to them, in this matter. I shall bring my proofs faithfully from their Printed Books. And

§ XI.

(f) p. 94, 95.

I. WE have a parcel of Propositions set down in *Calderwood's History*, (f) of *M. Andrew Melvin's* Approbation, if not his Contrivance, as seems to appear from the Series of the History; amongst which propositions, these are to the present purpose. *That in the Council of Nice, for Eschewing of private Ordaining of Ministers, it was Statuted, That no Pastor should be appointed without the Consent of him who remained in the chief and principal City of the Province— That afterwards, in the latter Councils it was Statuted, that the laying on of Hands upon Pastors, after lawful Elections, should be by the Metropolitan, or Bishop of the chief and principal Town, the rest of the Bishops of the Province voting thereto. That the state of the Church being Corrupt, The name BISHOP, which before was common to the rest of the Pastors of the Province, began THEN (i. e. long after the Council of Nice, as appears from the Series of the propositions) without the Authority of God's Word, and ancient Custom of the Kirk, to be attributed to one. And that the power of Appointing and Ordaining Ministers and Ruling of Kirks, with the whole procuration of Ecclesiastical Discipline was now Devolved to one Metropolitan only, The other Pastors no ways Challenging their Right and privilege therein, of very slothfulness on the one part, and the Devil on the other part going about, craftily to lay the Ground of Papistical Supremacy. Here, you see it was after the Council of Nice, (i. e. after the Year 325, nay some good time after it) that there was any such thing as proper Prelacy; nay even that the Name Bishop, which before was common to the rest of the Pastors (that is the Presbyters or Parish Ministers in the Modern Presbyterian Sense) began to be attributed to one. I say, The Parish Ministers, &c. for that such are meant is evident from those same propositions; it being expressly said in one of them, That the Ordaining and appointing of Pastors, which is also called the Laying on of Hands, appertaineth not to one Bishop only; but to those who are of the same Province or PRESBYTERY, and with the like Jurisdiction and Authority, Ministers at their Kirks. In short, it is plain from the whole Scheme of those Propositions, that they were Contrived for justifying the Presbyterian Model.*

§ XII.

2. THE Author of the *Course of Conformity* engrosses a Pamphlet in his Book, which Pamphlet seems to have been Written Anno 1606. And the purpose of the third Chapter of it is to prove, *That Bishopry (as he calls it) is against the Doctrine*

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

7

Doctrine of the Fathers and Doctors of the Kirk Antient and Modern. And in that Chapter I read thus, *Leaving Greg. Nazianz, Basil, and Epiphanius of the Greek, and Hieronymus with Augustine chief of the Latines, I will conclude with Gregory the great Bishop of Rome, who AT THE FIRST ENTRY OF THE HIERARCHY into the Kirk, and of the Tyranny of the Antichrist, Terms John of Constantinople his forerunner, &c.* So that if we may believe this Author, The *Hierarchy* had its *first Entry* into the *Kirk* only in *Gregories time*, i. e. not till about the beginning of the *Seventh Century*.

3. M. CALDERWOOD in his *Altare Damascenum* not only tells us, "That he that was called Bishop in St. Cyprian's time had no *Negative Voice* in the Ecclesiastical Senate. (g) (g) p. 265. § XIII.

"But also, that (during the first three Centuries) Churches were equal and their Presbyters equal. That before the division of Titles or Parishes, they were all equal in Honour and Power: That if any such thing as Prelacy had obtain'd in the Church, either in the 2d. or the 3d. Centuries, to use the gentlest Expression, it had been the effect of Imprudence, and a Violation of the Divine Ordinance or Order, which was justly restored after so many Centuries, in the Reformed Churches— But I deny (saies he) that any such thing had got footing in those first Ages, i. e. in the 2d. and 3d. Centuries. (h)

(b) Certe si tale institutum obtinuisset in Ecclesiis sine 2da. Annorum Centuria sine 3tia. imprudenter, ne quid gravius dicam, Violatum Ordinem Divinum dicerem & post tot annorum Cen-

turias rursus in Ecclesiis Reformatis jure restitutum; in aliis summa cum Ecclesiarum injuria non instauratum. Sed negamus id factum esse primis illis Seculis. *Alt. Dam.* p. 287.

IT were easy to bring more Testimonies from him to this purpose. And perhaps it has been upon this account § XIV.

that he treats St. *Jerome* so irreverently for saying that at *Alexandria*, ever since the Days of St. *Mark*, "The Presbyters choosed one whom they placed in an higher Station, and called him Bishop, &c. For when he comes to Consider that saying of *Jerom's*, (i) he say's, that That Father has stuff'd (i) *Alt. Dam.* his Writings with Gross Errors in Chronology and palpable P. 125, 126. Contradictions. Perhaps it has been likewise for the same Reason, that on all occasions, he Rejects *Jerom's Book* about *Ecclesiastical Writers* as Spurious. (k) But what ever be of those (k) p. 140, 141, things, it is evident from what I have Cited, that he allows 142, 252, 259. not any proper Episcopacy to have obtained during the first theer Centuries.

§ XV.

4. LIGHTON in his famous Book Entituled, *Zions plea against Prelacy*, tells us, that *This Ordinance of God, (i. e. Presbyterian Government) and practice Apostolical, continued for the space of 300 Years and upward, (l) That till the time of Pope Silvester, about the Year 320, Rome it self was without any Lordship at all, upon which Lordship followed that Blasphemous Arrianism, which afterwards made all the Churches of God to Groan under it. (m) Nay farther, That till the Year 607. every particular Church was Govern'd by the Bishops, (i. e. Presbyters) Elders and Deacons of the same; And altho' some before this were Titular Bishops, yet their Superiority the Church would not bear. (n)*

§ XVI.

5. THE Author of *The Defence of the unlawfulness and danger of limited Prelacy, &c.* Printed 1641. affirms that *Episcopacy (even the most Moderate) is a Plant which God never set in his Garden. And that it was a meer Stranger to the Ancient Church for some Hundreds of Years. (o) Nay, Believe him, and Episcopacy was not the Parent, (as his Brethren commonly give out) but the Child of the Papacy. It was ever a stranger to the Church till the Pope had usurped, mainly by the help of his Episcopal jurisdiction, many Antichristian Privileges. (p) And, we shall be glad (says he to his Adversary) to see your Affirmation proved, namely, That ever there was in the Church of God any such Bishops (i. e. Bishops who pretended to a CHIEF only, and not to a SOLE Power, for his Adversary, as himself Confesses, pleaded only for such Bishops) before the Pope had brought his Bishoprick to the Cope-stone of Antichristianism. (q) Once more, When it comes to the exactest search it will appear that Episcopacy was at most but an Human Ecclesiastical Constitution, not Received upon any better Grounds than the primacy of the Patriarch of Rome, than the manifold Fraternities of Monks, Friars and Nuns, &c. (r) What Sense is in these Citations, how they agree with the common pretence about the Mystery of Iniquity, &c. And whether they imploy manifest Contradictions is not my present business to Determin. 'Tis enough for that to take notice of one Effort more of this Authors skillful Zeal. In Episcopal Government (says he) (s) you differ little less from the Ancient Kirk, than from the Reformed; — for the Ancient Presbytery is a Stranger to your Land; (i. e. England) And your Episcopacy would be as great a Stranger in any Christian Kirk, for the first 500 Years, as the Duke of Muscovia would be this Day in Venice, or the Empire of Tiberius in Rome, in the Daies of Cato the Elder.*

The principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

2

6 I have seen another Pamphlet Printed that same Year, § XVII.
1641 Entitled, *Certain Reasons tending to prove the unlawfulness
and unexpediency of all Diocesan Episcopacy, even the most moderate:*
And the Author of it tells us, *That the first mention we find of
Bishops, as distinct from Presbyters, is not till about 200 Years af-
ter Christ; which also, (says he) some of the Bishop's own Party
do not deny. (t) I cannot forbear to say, That those of the (t) p. 9. § 5
Bishop's Party, who did not deny this, have been pretty
yielding, or this Author has been pretty Confident: But to go
on.*

7. Mr. RUTHERFOORD in his *Peaceable and Temperate Plea* § XVIII.
for Paul's Presbytery, (u) affirms, *That if we believe Antiquity, (u) p. 18.
Ignatius, who was very ancient, describeth our very (Scottish)
Presbytery, and calleth it a Senate of Pastors and Elders, that was
in the Church in his time. See Origen, who (says Mr. Samuel)
lived with Tertullian, resembleth the Presbyter to the Senate of a
City, and Ruffinus agreeth with them. Cyprian saith, The Pres-
byters and other Officers have the Power of the Keys: So the Ni-
cene Council, &c. Here not only Presbytery in St. Cyprian's
Age, &c. The Ages before him, but even in Ruffinus his time,
who flourish'd not till about the end of the 4th Century.*

8. Mr. PETRIE in his *Compendious History of the Catholick* § XIX.
Church, &c. Tom. I. Not only affirms, *That all Men do consent
that in the time of the Apostles, there was no difference between Bi-
shops and Presbyters; (v) which is Bold enough. But he affirms (v) p. 280.
farther, That Bishops in St. Cyprian's time, were no other than
Pastors of particular Congregations: (w) And, That it may be (w) p. 281.
thought of some Questions, much stood upon now, that, had they
been ask'd of Cyprian, He had answer'd, I KNOW NOT; as
what difference between the Ordination of a Minister, and the Con-
secration of a Bishop? (x) Nay, That even in Austin's time, (x) p. 286.
Bishops were only so many Pastors of several Congregations: (y) (y) p. 280.
That in Jerom's time, a Bishop was only a Moderator: (z) And (z) p. 279.
indeed, I must confess, this is every whit as true as what he
has in that same Page, viz. That *Heraclas* and *Dionysius B. B.*
of Alexandria, were *Jerom's* Contemporaries. But to proceed:
This Learned Author has found no fewer than four National
Churches, viz. The *African*, the *British*, the *Scottish*, and
the *Irish*, all of them Govern'd without Prelates, some for the
space of 500, and some for the space of 1000 or 1100 Years: And
in every one of them, a Church Council, consisting partly of Elders
who were not Teachers. (a)*

D

9. THE (1) 283.

§ XX.

(b) p. 145.

(c) 150.

(d) Ibid.

(e) p. 155.

(f) 156.

(g) p. 161.

(b) p. 149.

§ XXI.

(i) p. 13.

9. THE true NON-CONFORMIST affirms, *That it is the consentient Opinion of the best Searchers on both sides, that in the primitive Times, and for 140 Years after our Saviour, no vestige of Prelacy appears upon Record.* (b) This is pretty fair to begin with. He is as peremptory, (c) *That it was only the ancient Prostasia (Moderatorship) and not Prelacy that was in St. Cyprian's Time, That, all the Epistle of the Roman Clergies to Cyprian, after the Death of Fabian contains, can amount to no more than a complaint of the want of a Moderator.* (d) And, what tho' Jerom affirms, that at Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist, to Heraclas and Dionysius BB. the Presbyters did always name one chosen of themselves, &c. plac'd him in a higher Degree. &c. What says this more, that in all that time, for Orders sake, thy had successive Presidents, at first, 'tis like, moveable, and thereafter fixed during Life? (e) Nay, *All the Prelacy that was in Jerom's Time, had not much exceeded the Limits of a simple Prostasia,* (f) Once more, He tells his Adversary, *That any Man who knows Church History, will easily grant that as for the first Century and a half, we have no Vestige upon Record of Prelative power so when negotius (i. e. Moderators) had place, their Concurrence in Presbyteries was only for Order, as being the Moderators: And a great deal more to this purpose.* (g) Indeed this mighty Author doubted not to prove even from the *Canons* commonly called *Apostolic*, the unlawfulness of our *Scottish Prelacy.* (b) To this purpose he Cites no fewer than ten or eleven of the first Fifty: And to make the Archivement the more surprizing, he insists mainly on the 4th, 20th, 24th, 33d, and 36th.

10. THE Author of the *Apology for, or Vindication of the oppressed persecuted Ministers,* &c. Published Anno 1677 tells the *Lords Temporal* of his Majestie's secret Council. (i) *That he and his Brethren Presbyterians cannot meet with the least probable Evidence for Diocesan Churches with one fixed Pastor overseeing other Pastors and their Flocks, either in Scripture or pure Antiquity.* 'Tis possible indeed, that he added the *Epi*ther, *PURE*, to *Antiquity*, that he might be in safety to deny that it was any longer *pure Antiquity* after the Introduction of *Episcopacy*: But I think it more reasonable to understand him as meaning the same thing with the rest of his Brethren; i. e. that *Episcopacy* is but a late corruption, a stranger to the three first Centuries, for sometimes they can be so frank as to allow that those first Centuries can be called *pure Antiquity.*

11. THE

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

I I

11. THE admirable Author of *Rectius Instruendum*, assures us, *That one may as soon join the Poles together, as prove by any faithful and authentick Testimony, That there was, either in the Apostles Times, or an Hundred Years and more afterwards, a Diocesan Prelate:* And this (he says) *He speaks far within compass.* (k) Now if St. John lived to the end of the first, by this Reckoning, there was no Prelacy, at least, for the two first Centuries: I say, at least, for his *far within compass*, for any thing I know, may extend to a great many more Centuries; especially if we consider that he tells us again (l) *That in those first Times, when the Episcopus præses was set up, and for some AGES afterwards, not only the Presbyters but the People had a great interest in their Choice.* And for this, he cites Cyprian; from which it is plain, that according to this Author, a Bishop in Cyprian's time was only an *Episcopus præses*, i. e. in plain Scotch, a *Presbyterian Moderator*. Nay, to put his meaning out of doubt, he tells us (m) *That even in Jerome's time the change was but small. A Bishop was only a fixed Moderator, and far from the present Prelacy; for even then it was but come the length of taking from Presbyters, Ordination, or rather the Ritual part of it.* (k) p. 187. (l) p. 228. (m) p. 261, 262.

§ XXII.

12. I come now to G. R. himself, whom I have reserved to the last place: One as zealous as any to have Episcopacy a very late Corruption. I shall only instance in two of his Books, both of them publish'd since the beginning of the late Revolution. These are the Words of his 12th Proposition, in his *True Representation of Presbyterian Government*, Printed Anno 1690. *The Lord hath equally entrusted all his Servants the Ministers, not only with the Power of Dispensing the Word and Sacraments, but also with the Power of Governing the Church, which by his appointment, and according to the practice of the FIRST and BEST AGES of the Church, ought to be, and WAS DONE, in common, by Ministers ACTING in PARITY, and not by a single Prelate set over the rest. This is acknowledg'd by MOST, and the MOST EMINENT of our prelatick Brethren. Is not this bold enough.*

§ XXIII.

BUT hear him again, in his *Rational Defence of Non conformity*, written against D. Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of the Separation from the Church of England*, published Anno 1689. D. Stillingfleet had Argued for Episcopacy from the *Incredibility*, (not *Impossibility*, as G. R. calls it) of such a sudden Change of the Government of the Church from the plain Institutions of Christ, and the unalterable Rules of Government which

§ XXIV.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled

- n) *Unreasonable* he had fixed in his Church (n) And G. R. Answers, *That it*
leness of Sepa- was not done suddenly, but by insensible Steps, in the space of three
 P. 226. or four hundred Years: Cyprian (says he) lived in the third
 Century, and Diocesan Episcopacy was not then settled. (o) Again,
 (o) *Rat. Defence* &c. p. 156, we deny that Diocesan Episcopacy prevailed in the Church for the
 157. first 300 Years, or that it was generally in the 4th Century: And
 we are willing to enter the Lists with our Brethren, on this Debate,
 (p) p. 159. about the first and purest Antiquity of Church Government. (p)
 And, what Jerom saith, *Toto Orbe Decretum est*, is not to be
 understood of the Decree of an Oecumenick Council, for no such Decree
 can be produced; but that this Remedy of Schism (i. e. Episcopacy)
 in many places began THEN to be thought on; and it was no wonder
 that this Corruption began THEN to creep in, it being THEN
 (q) 170. about the end of the 4th Century, when Jerom wrote. (q) Again
 D. Stillingfleet having laid it down as an inviolable Rule in
 St. Cyprian's time, that there would be but one Bishop in a
 City, G. R. tells him, *He is little concern'd in this, that he can see*
no Rule for it, except a Canon of Conc. Cabilon. which was but
Provincial, and very late, under Pope Eugenius, about the Year
654, yet methinks it was generally practised: For taking a Bishop,
(says he) for the πρεσβυς (i. e. Moderator) among the Pres-
byters, which I affirm to have been the Dialect of those Times, what
needed more Bishops than one, seeing all the Presbyters of one City
might conveniently meet, ordinarily, for the exercise of Discipline?
 (r) p. 174. &c. (r) Nay, if we may believe him, there was plain Presbytery
 in Alexandria in Athanasius's time: He was Moderator, and
 the Presbyters of the Churches of *Mareotis* belong'd to that
 Presbytery. (s) Again, D. Stillingfleet had insisted on the Te-
 (s) p. 177. stimony of Theodorit; and G. R. answers (t) *The Doctor in-*
 (t) p. 178. *sulteth much on this Testimony, but without cause, for Theodorit*
lived in the 5th Century; and we deny not, but by that time,
Episcopal Ambition had in some places encroached on the Govern-
ment instituted by Christ, and which had been kept more intire in
former Ages. Now it is certain, Theodorit did not give that
Account on which D. Stillingfleet laid such stress, before the
Year 420. Once more, D. Stillingfleet had Cited the Canons
of the African Church in St. Austin's time; and G. R. answers,
What he saith of the African Churches, &c. let him prove that a
Bishop, by himself, exercised Discipline in them: The Bishop is of-
ten named as the Speaker in the Presbytery: By declining of him
is meant declining of them. (u) So that even in St. Austin's time

(u) p. 189.

(who

(who lived till the Year 430) nothing but *pure* Presbytery in the *African* Churches.

IT had been easy to have adduced a great many more Citations from G. R's. Writings to this purpose; but these may be sufficient: For, from them, we may see it plain enough, that by his reckoning Episcopacy is an *arrant Novelty*, an *Usurpation* not thought on before the end of the 4th Century, beginning to make Encroachments on Christ's true Government in the Infancy of the 5th Century, not come to any considerable height till that Century was well grown, perhaps Hoary Headed; nay acknowledg'd to be a *Novelty* by MOST, and the MOST EMINENT Prelatists; so that it was but in conformity to his old, his fix'd, his often repeated Principles, that he was so confident in his *Defence* of his *Second Vindication*, in that Paragraph which gave occasion to *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age*. §. XXV.

THUS I have made it appear, by a full dozen of Instances, how much unanimous our *Scotish* Advocates for Presbytery have been in representing Episcopacy as a notorious Novelty; that is, in plain terms, how unanimous they have been in *Abusing* the People, and *Imposing* on them for undoubted Truth a most groundless, gross, notorious Falshood. Whether their unanimity in this Matter has proceeded from their unskillfulness in Church History or from sinister Design; whether they have so boldly advanc'd such an Untruth, with, or without competent Knowledge of Antiquity; or whether they could Conscientiously advance it either with or without such competent Knowledge, is not my present business to determine. All I do now aim at, is to shew the Reasons which mov'd me to enquire into the Principles of the *Cyprianic* Age, with regard to Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction. And that our Brethrens so very zealous obtrusion of such false History on their Disciples was *one* good Reason for such an undertaking (if not clear enough already) shall be made fully clear very soon, that is, after I have named one Consideration more, which likewise prompted me to such an Undertaking. And it is, §. XXVI.

III. That the *fixing* of the Principles of the *Cyprianic* Age appear'd to me to be of considerable usefulness for determining one Controversy, which for many Years we have had with our Presbyterian Brethren; the Controversy concerning the Sentiments of our Reformers, and the Principles §. XXVII.

IXXX 2
 ples on which, at first, they settled the Government of this National Church. For divers Years before I knew of any such Book as that, called *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, &c.* I had observ'd that same very thing which that Author has told us from *Knox's History, viz.* That our Reformers propos'd to themselves the Scriptures, not simply, indeed, neither as Senced by their own or any Modern Glosses, but as Senced and Interpreted by the Principles and Practice of the Primitive Church, as their Rule according to which they Resolved this Church should be Reformed. And now to bring home these Considerations to that for which I design'd them.

§. XXVIII. HAVING consider'd these three things, and withal having Reflected on the *Cyprianic Age*; the *Age* to which G. R. had so confidently appealed, I found it an *Age* which had all the Advantages which one could reasonably desire to determine him to *fix* the *Principles* of it, if he was inclin'd to *fix* the *Principles* of any *Age*, after that of the Apostles, and not only so, but that *Age* did likewise appear to me most perfectly to answer my Design with respect to the aforesaid three Considerations.

§. XXIX. I. I say, it appear'd to me an *Age* which had all the Advantages needful in Reason to determine one to *fix* its *Principles*, who was inclin'd to *fix* the *Principles* of any *Age* after that of the Apostles. Particularly.

§. XXX. I. IT had this great Advantage, that it was an *Age* in which Secular Governments had not yet shewn any tokens of Favour, any Expressions of Kindness to those who profess'd the Christian Principles: Much less had they imparted any thing of Temporal Greatness, or given any Secular Encouragements to the Governours of Christian Churches. It was an *Age* which as much as any before it, had all the *Humiliation*, and all the *Purification*, all the *Admonition* and all the *Correction*; and all the *sharp Discipline*, and all the *solid Refinement* which *Persecutions* both *violent* and *frequent* could give it. An *Age* very far from being apt to cherish Ambition, or the Affectation of any undue or unwarrantable heights in any Professors of Christianity; an *Age* in which the being an eminent Governour of the Church, was the exposing of the Person, whoever he was, to the first Brunt of the fiery Trial; an *Age* indeed liable to none of the popular Objections commonly muster'd up against some following *Ages*; an *Age*

an *Age* on which it could not be charg'd that either the Favour of Princes, or the abundance of Riches, or the Pomps of the World, or the Privileges and Immunities of Ecclesiasticks, or any thing of that Nature hath corrupted it.

2. IT had likewise this great Advantage, that it was an *Age* of much Ecclesiastical Business, none after the Apostles had more. It was an *Age* in which divers *Schisms* happen'd, and divers considerable *Questions*, especially concerning Matters of Discipline and Policy were toss'd and ventilated. There were the *Schisms* of *Novatian* at *Rome*, and *Felicissimus* and his Complices at *Carthage*. There was the Momentous Point of Discipline about the *Pennances* and *Reconciliations* of the *Lapsed*; and the every whit as Momentous, but much more difficult *Question* about the *validity* of *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Baptisms and Ordinances; whereupon happen'd the notable Dissention between *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* and *St. Cyprian*, *Firmilian* and a great many more great Men, Members of the Episcopal College. These and divers other considerable Events which happen'd in that *Age*, gave frequent Opportunities for frequent Synods and Convocations of great Clerks; for frequent Correspondences by Ecclesiastical Embassies, for frequent Discussions of considerable Matters by Episcopal and Synodical Epistles. In short, it was an *Age* of much and great *Actions*, by consequence an *Age* singularly fitted for affording considerable Discoveries of the *Methods* of the *Administration* and *Exercise*, as well as of the *Frame* and *Constitution* of the Government of Churches. Add to this,

3 THAT it was an *Age* of great Men, such as *Fabianus*, §. XXXII. who was Miraculously promoted to the *See* of *Rome*; *Cornelius*, *Lucius*, *Stephanus*, *Xystus* his Successors: *Firmilian* Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, *Alexander* of *Jerusalem*, *Fabius* of *Antioch*, the great *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, *Gregorius Thaumaturgus*, the vastly Learned *Origen*, and a great many more whose Names *Eusebius* has Recorded; especially the admirable *St. Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*. All these I say, were very great Men, most of them singularly good Men; many of them glorious Martyrs. Not to mention *Novatus* and *Novatianus* and such others as bred Disturbances to the Church; tho' when such are Men of Parts (as it is certain *Novatianus* was) their Projects and Plots, their Motions and their Applications, their nimble Arts and Politicks cannot but

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

but contribute much for coming by the Knowledge of the *Principles* which then prevail'd.

§. XXXIII. 4. IT was an *Age* that was in a manner singular for this Advantage that it had transmitted to Posterity, many excellent Records, many Synodical Epistles and Forms and Constitutions; many Epistles of all sorts, Epistles from Bishops to their Clergy; from Bishops to Bishops, from all parts of Christendom; many of them still extant; from which being accurately sifted, with the help of other Monuments, I judge it no insuperable task to draw an intelligible Scheme of the *Principles* which then prevail'd, with regard to Church Government. Particularly, the excellent Monuments of the excellent *Cyprian*, not only justly valued as incomparable Records of Antiquity by the most Learned Moderns, but also honour'd with the greatest veneration by the greatest Ancients; by none more than *Jerome* himself, our Brethrens most zealously pretended Patron, as were easy to prove if it were needful. These Four are certainly very great Advantages of that Age; but then there are other two, which to me, appear'd to be of no less, if not of greater Consequence. Namely,

§. XXXIV. 5. THE *Cyprianic Age* had this Advantage, that the extraordinary Manifestations and Communications of the Divine Spirit had not then ceased, but continued in very great plenty, as may be observ'd every where in the Writings of *St. Cyprian* and his Contemporaries, as I shall afterwards have occasion to Discourse more fully. (w) How great an advantage is this? For how incredible is it that those who had such frequent and distinct Manifestations of the Mind of God Communicated to 'em in an extraordinary manner, by that same Spirit which directed the Apostles in constituting the Government of Churches, should have quite overturn'd that Constitution and set up another? And this advantage will be found to be of yet greater weight and consequence, when it is adverted to, that those who lived in that *Age* do particularly insist on those Manifestations as signal in the Designation and Promotion of Persons to the Episcopal Office, and in the directing, protecting, vindicating, encouraging them in the Administration of that Office, to which they were so extraordinarily promoted. But of these things (as I said) more fully hereafter:

(w) CAP. X.
§. vii. &c.

6. THE last great Advantage which I shall name, and §. XXXV. which I have reserved to the last place, because I am to discourse it a little more fully, is, That those of the *Cyprianic Age* were not so far removed from the times of the Apostles, but that they might have been very well acquainted with the State of Government, in which the Apostles left the Churches, before they left the World. For if you reckon from the Death of the Apostle St. John to St. Cyprian's promotion to the See of Carthage, you shall find only 148, or at most 150 Years. And now I ask (not what *impossibility*, but) what *difficulty* could there be in tracing the Constitution of Church Government through the neither many nor uneasy Stages of 150 Years? Common Sense tells us that nothing can be more traceable than notable Changes in the publick Government of Societies. The well being of every Society has such an intimate Dependence on the Temperament and Constitution of its Government, that nothing about it can be of greater Consequence to it; and if so, then certainly, nothing about it can lie open to more Observers, or nicer Observation. Few Members of the Society but must find in it their share, or their Privilege; their Expectation or their Security; something or other, some way or other, that may oblige them to have their Eyes upon it. All this must be obvious to any thinking Person.

IT is equally evident that *substantial Innovations* in the §. XXXVI: Government of the Church, must be expos'd to as accurate Observation as in the Government of any other Society. The Church is a Society erected on the surest Foundation, and for the noblest ends; for securing and promoting Mens greatest and most precious *Interests*. If therefore those *Interests* do depend as much on the publick Government of the Church, as the *Interests* of other Societies do on their respective Governments; and if Substantial Innovations in the Governments of other Societies are so naturally Attractive of the accuratest Observation; they must needs be so, in the highest degree, in the Government of the Church. Besides this,

THE Christians of the *Cyprianic Age* were peculiarly bound §. XXXVII. both by Principle and Interest to have observ'd and resisted such *Innovations* with a peculiar Accuracy. It was not only a receiv'd Principle, then, that the Government of the Church was settled by the Apostles, who were acted and assisted by an infallible Spirit; but also (as afterwards I shall shew more fully, (w) that all Innovations, all Recessions from

(w) Chap. 10.
§. LVI. LVII.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

but contribute much for coming by the Knowledge of the *Principles* which then prevail'd.

§. XXXIII. 4. IT was an *Age* that was in a manner singular for this Advantage that it had transmitted to Posterity, many excellent Records, many Synodical Epistles and Forms and Constitutions; many Epistles of all sorts, Epistles from Bishops to their Clergy; from Bishops to Bishops, from all parts of Christendom; many of them still extant; from which being accurately sifted, with the help of other Monuments, I judge it no insuperable task to draw an intelligible Scheme of the *Principles* which then prevail'd, with regard to Church Government. Particularly, the excellent Monuments of the excellent *Cyprian*, not only justly valued as incomparable Records of Antiquity by the most Learned Moderns, but also honour'd with the greatest veneration by the greatest Ancients; by none more than *Jerome* himself, our Brethrens most zealously pretended Patron, as were easy to prove if it were needful. These Four are certainly very great Advantages of that Age; but then there are other two, which to me, appear'd to be of no less, if not of greater Consequence. Namely,

§. XXXIV. 5. THE *Cyprianic Age* had this Advantage, that the extraordinary Manifestations and Communications of the Divine Spirit had not then ceased, but continued in very great plenty, as may be observ'd every where in the Writings of *St. Cyprian* and his Contemporaries, as I shall afterwards have occasion to Discourse more fully. (w) How great an advantage is this? For how incredible is it that those who had such frequent and distinct Manifestations of the Mind of God Communicated to 'em in an extraordinary manner, by that same Spirit which directed the Apostles in constituting the Government of Churches, should have quite overturn'd that Constitution and set up another? And this advantage will be found to be of yet greater weight and consequence, when it is adverted to, that those who lived in that *Age* do particularly insist on those Manifestations as signal in the Designation and Promotion of Persons to the Episcopal Office, and in the directing, protecting, vindicating, encouraging them in the Administration of that Office, to which they were so extraordinarily promoted. But of these things (as I said) more fully hereafter:

(w) CAP. X.
§. vii. &c.

6. THE last great Advantage which I shall name, and §. XXXV. which I have reserved to the last place, because I am to discourse it a little more fully, is, That those of the *Cyprianic Age* were not so far removed from the times of the Apostles, but that they might have been very well acquainted with the State of Government, in which the Apostles left the Churches, before they left the World. For if you reckon from the Death of the Apostle St. *John* to St. *Cyprian's* promotion to the See of *Carthage*, you shall find only 148, or at most 150 Years. And now I ask (not what *impossibility*, but) what *difficulty* could there be in tracing the Constitution of Church Government through the neither many nor uneasy Stages of 150 Years? Common Sense tells us that nothing can be more traceable than notable Changes in the publick Government of Societies. The well being of every Society has such an intimate Dependence on the Temperament and Constitution of its Government, that nothing about it can be of greater Consequence to it; and if so, then certainly, nothing about it can lie open to more Observers, or nicer Observation. Few Members of the Society but must find in it their share, or their Privilege; their Expectation or their Security; something or other, some way or other, that may oblige them to have their Eyes upon it. All this must be obvious to any thinking Person.

IT is equally evident that *substantial Innovations* in the §. XXXVI: Government of the Church, must be expos'd to as accurate Observation as in the Government of any other *Society*. The Church is a *Society* erected on the surest Foundation, and for the noblest ends; for securing and promoting Mens greatest and most precious *Interests*. If therefore those *Interests* do depend as much on the publick Government of the Church, as the *Interests* of other *Societies* do on their respective Governments; and if Substantial Innovations in the Governments of other *Societies* are so naturally Attractive of the accuratest Observation; they must needs be so, in the highest degree, in the Government of the Church. Besides this,

THE Christians of the *Cyprianic Age* were peculiarly bound §. XXXVII. both by *Principle* and *Interest* to have observ'd and resisted such *Innovations* with a peculiar Accuracy. It was not only a receiv'd *Principle*, then, that the Government of the Church was settled by the Apostles, who were acted and assisted by an infallible Spirit; but also (as afterwards I shall (w) Chap. 10. shew more fully, §. LVI. LVII. (w) that all Innovations, all Recessions from

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

Apostolic Institutions and Determinations were highly Criminal and Execrable. Indeed, if we take our Measures by the *Principles* which then prevail'd, we will find reason to believe that *Substantial Innovations* would neither have been more readily nor more accurately observ'd in the *Creed* than in the *Government* of the Church. Neither can this seem a Paradox to any Man who has consider'd that the *Creed* of that *Age* was not more concern'd in any thing than the *Unity* of the Church. And what one thing can have a stricter dependence on another than the *Unity* of the Church must needs have upon the *Constitution* and *Administration* of her Government?

§. XXXVIII. THEY were as much bound to guard against *Innovations* by all the *Laws* and *ties* of *Interest*. Indeed their Principles led them to look upon *Innovations*, especially substantial *Innovations* in Church Government, as highly dangerous to their greatest *Interests*; as unavoidably inferring all the *Dangers* that could result from neglecting *Divine Institutions*, or forsaking *Apostolic Definitions*, *i. e.* preferring their own fallible *Prudence* to the infallible *Directions* of the Holy Ghost, could amount to. Besides,

§. XXXIX. HOW much was it the *Interest* of Christians in those times, to guard against all such *Innovations* as might have had the least appearance of thwarting the *Definitions* of the *Founders* of their Religion, when we consider them with regard to the *Enemies* of their Religion? How much was not only the *spight* of the *Jews*, but the *Zeal* as well as the *Might* of the *then* Civil Government of all the then *Heathen World* bent against them? How frequently, how miserably, how barbarously, how unmercifully were they *Persecuted*, *Harassed*, *Massacred*, *Tyranniz'd* over upon pretence that they were *Fanciful* and *Peevish*, *Willful* and *Humourous*, pure *Fanatics* that had no solid nor accountable *Principles*? And how much had it made for the relevancy of such *Pretences* if they had not firmly adher'd to the *Original Institutions* of their *Founders*? If they had deserted the first *Masters* of their *Profession*? If they had avow'd by their *Practice* that they were not afraid to make substantial *Deviations* from those they own'd, and pretended to Honour, as the *Holy*, the *Infallible*, the divinely inspir'd *Propagators* of their Religion? How easie had it been for their *Enemies*, not only the *Philosophers*, the *Celsus's* and *Porphyrus's*, who *Disputed* and wrote against them, but also for the *Sovereign Powers* them,

which made the *Edicts*, and the *Magistrates* which Executed them, to have form'd such Innovations and Recessions from the Institutions of their Founders, into a strong and unanswerable Argument, that they were but unconscientious pretenders to *Principles*, especially to *Principles* of Divine Revelation, seeing they could so easily and unconcern'dly depart from them, or run counter to them?

THESE things duly weigh'd, no more seems to remain §. XL. to be consider'd but this, whether, however much the Christians of the *Cyprianic Age* might have been dispos'd both by *Principle* and *Interest* to have guarded against all *Innovations*, yet the Space of 150 Years was such, as that, therein, Substantial Innovations might have been made, and they not able to *Trace* them? Neither able to discover when they were made, nor if they were at all made? And by consequence whether they might not have swallowed down those Innovations without any Reluctancy? Whether they might not have been so impos'd on, as that, tho' they really were very great, very dangerous, very scandalous Innovations, yet, they were so far from deeming them such, that they took them for the Original Institutions of their Sect, handed down to them in that same Integrity and Purity in which the Apostles committed them to their immediate Disciples? This, I say, is the only remaining Question; a Question, which I think, may admit of a very easie and satisfactory Decision. For certainly,

ALL things consider'd, an hundred and fifty Years was §. XLI. not so long a time but that such a remarkable Matter of *Fact* as the Instituted *Form* of Church Government, might very well have been traced from the End to the Beginning of it. I cannot imagine that our Presbyterian Brethren themselves can deny this: Sure I am, they ought not, in reason they cannot, till first they have much abated of, if not quite thrown up their ordinary Confidence, in the same very Controversie about Church Government. For if those of the *Cyprianic Age* were in any such hazard of being Deceived, while they had this *Back-scent* to run only for 150, what security can our Brethren have, that they may not be deceiv'd, when they have to run it back, for more than 1550 Years? who sees not that the disparity is very great between 150 and 1550, or rather 1600? Can our Brethren lay claim to any more Zeal, or any more Sagacity, any more Light, or any greater Application, any more Piety, or Probity, or Charity, or Humi-

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

lity, or Faith, any thing that may have more disposed them for the extraordinary Favour of an infallible Direction, than the Catholick Christians, the noble Confessors, the glorious Martyrs, the devout and holy Bishops and Presbyters of the *Cyprianic Age* might have laid claim to ? For example, has Mr. *Forrester* or Mr. *Rule*, or Mr. *Jamison*, either more or greater Advantages for knowing what was the *Form* of Government settled in the Churches by the Apostles, than *Cornelius* or *Fabius*, *Origen* or *Dionysius*, *Firmilian* or *St. Cyprian* ? But this reasoning being only *ad Hominem*, I shall insist no longer on it ; only I cannot see how our Brethren can otherwise invalidate it, than by throwing up their wonted Assurance, and acknowledging, at least, that it is every whit as *Possible*, and much more *probable* for themselves to be, than it was for those of the *Cyprianic Age* to have been in hazard of being deceived in this Matter. But leaving this way of reasoning, as I have said,

§. XLII.

(x) See Chap. x.
§. vii, &c.

I DO affirm that those of the *Cyprianic Age* had all the Advantages that were needful to secure them against all danger of deception in such an enquiry. Besides all the Canonical Books of Scripture, which they had in as great Integrity as our Brethren can pretend to have them : Besides the extraordinary Manifestations and Directions of the Spirit, which certainly they had, (x) and to which our Brethren, for any thing I know, can make no reasonable Pretences : Besides these, I say, they had many written Records on which they might have relied as securely and with as little Fear of being deceived, as any Man can rely on any Records concerning any Matter of Fact.

§. XLIII.

THEY had not only the Epistles of *Clemens*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarpus*, &c. not only the larger Volumes of *Hegeippus*, *Irenaeus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian* and innumerable other unexceptionable Witnesses to instruct them in this Matter, but also the Catalogues of Bishops, in their Regular Successions to their respective *Sees*, carefully handed down to them from the very first Foundations of those *Sees*. And they had vast numbers of Epistles of many different kinds written by Synods to Synods, by Bishops to Bishops, by Churches to Churches, about all things that happen'd, in which either the Government or the Discipline of the Church were Interest-ed. By all which Monuments and Records they might have as fully learned what had been the Government instituted by the Apo-

Apostles, and whether *Substantial Innovations* had been made in it, as we can learn by the Records of the 5th or 6th Centuries, what the *Form* of Church Government was in those Centuries.

BESIDES those Advantages, the distance they liv'd at from §. XLIV. the Apostles was not so great but that they might have very well trusted even *Oral Tradition* concerning such a remarkable and distinguishable Matter of Fact as was the Form of Government instituted by the Apostles. Even such as have no singular dexterity at Thinking may sufficiently perceive this by a very easie and a very plain Supposition; for example, There can be nothing either obscure or uneasie in supposing that three Men of common Sense and common Honesty, may (each of them) attain to 72 Years of Age. It is every whit as easie to suppose that the first of those three was born *Anno* 80, the second, *Anno* 132, and the third, *Anno* 184; now, without supposing more, it is plain that the *Tradition* might have been handed down very securely. For the second, at the 20th Year of his Age, was both capable enough to receive, and might have received the Account full and distinct from the first, who, by the Supposition was Aged about 20, before St. *John* the Apostle died. And what should have hindred the Third, when aged 20 to have received it from the second, and withal to have been made a Bishop, *Anno* 248 (the Year in which St. *Cyprian* was made Bishop of *Carthage*) and to have continued in that Station full 8 Years, and died at length of the supposed Age of 72? But indeed we need not lay the stress of this Matter on any fancied Supposition however Reasonable; for

IN the Records of those times we have frequent Instances §. XLV. of Persons who might actually have handed down the *Tradition* with the greatest Security. Thus, for example, it is uncontroverted that *Iræneus* was so much Contemporary with St. *Polycarp* and *Potbinus* (his own immediate Predecessor in the Episcopal Chair of *Lions*) that he not only might, but did actually learn from them what Form of Government the Apostles settled in the Churches. Both of their own proper Knowledge were capable to have taught him. According to the most accurate Accounts, *Polycarpus*, aged 86, died *An.* 147. By consequence he was born *An.* 61. that is, he was aged 39 before St. *John's* Death; nay, 'tis as certain as the certainty of History can make it, that he was consecrated Bishop of *Smyrna* by that Apostle. *Potbinus* was aged

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled

90 when he was raised to the Glory of Martyrdom *An.* 167. Born then he was *An.* 77. aged 23, when St. *John* died, *Irenæus* aged 50, before the Death of St. *Polycarp*, and 70 before the Death of *Pothinus*, lived at least till the year 190. And what could have hindred a third to have received the Accounts from him, which he received from *Polycarpus* and *Pothinus*, and withal to have lived till St. *Cyprian* was made Bishop of *Carthage*? 'Tis certain this might very well have been, tho' that third had not attained to the Years of *Polycarpus* or *Pothinus*, or *Irenæus*. Again,

§. XLVI.

ALEXANDER Bishop of *Jerusalem* (who died not before the Year 250.) according to the common reckoning, was chosen assistant to *Narcissus* Bishop of that See, about the Year 212. And if he was then capable of Administrating the Episcopal Office, I hope he was capable of comprehending such Accounts as *Narcissus* was able to give him. Now *Narcissus* was aged then about 116, as *Alexander* tells us in an Epistle, whereof we have a *Fragment* in *Eusebius*. (y) By consequence 'tis plain that he was Contemporary with thousands who were Contemporary with St. *John*; and might have been Contemporary with Scores, nay Hundreds, who were St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*'s Contemporaries. It were easie to adduce divers such instances to be found in ancient History, but it is needless: For indeed

§. XLVII.

ALL Mankind has still reckoned that *Tradition* may safely and purely hand down *signal Events*, or *remarkable Matters of Fact* thro' such a decurle of Years. Nay some of the greatest Men have thought it highly reasonable to transmit to Posterity as unquestionable History, *Matters of Fact* of far less Consequence, and far less Remarkable, upon the bare Credit of *Tradition*, after as many Years as now we are discoursing of. I might adduce many Instances, but I shall only name St. *Ferom*, our Brethrens pretended Patron. He in his Account of *Tertullian* (z) tells us, as unquestionable Truth, that St. *Cyprian* scarcely ever spent a Day without reading something of *Tertullian*'s Writings; and that when he called for him, he said *Da Magistrum*, Give me my Master. And this Account he had from one *Paulus* an old Man, who when young had it from St. *Cyprian*'s Notary, the very Person who had so frequently given him his Master. Now it matters not when St. *Ferom* wrote this Account, seeing 'tis plain he might have written it at any time before his

Death?

(y) Catal. Scrip.
Eccles.

Death; and by Consequence more than 160 Years after the Death of St. Cyprian. And I dare refer it to any Man of Sense or Ingenuity to determine whether there was any greater difficulty for those of the *Cyprianic Age* to have learn'd by *Tradition* what the Form of Church Government was, which was settled by the Apostles; whether they settled it on the *Principles* of *Parity* or *Imparity*, than there was for St. Jerom to learn by it what value St. Cyprian put upon the Writings of *Tertullian*? Perhaps a great many other Considerations might be adduc'd for representing how easie it might have been for those of that Age to have discovered, if any Substantial Innovations had been Made in the Constitution of the Government of Churches after the Days of the Apostles; But I shall only add one more. It is,

THAT *they* had every way as great Advantages for making such a Discovery, as we of this Age can pretend to have for tracing the Alterations of Government, either in Church or State these 150 Years last past. Now, how many are there in Scotland who can travel backward thro' all the Substantial Innovations and Changes, which have been in the Civil Government of this Nation these 150 Years? And as for Church Government, How many of our Brethren are very confident that they can very distinctly pursue it up to the first dawns of our Reformation? (an interval of time much about the same length with that which was between the *Apostolic Age* and the *Cyprianic*) How many of them are persuaded that they can accurately account not only for all the considerable Alterations of Government since the Reformation; but also for the *Principles* on which our Reformers at first did settle it? Nay, was it not on the Supposition, That it was easie to trace a matter of *Fact* which lay at no greater distance than the Reformation, that in the beginning of the late Revolution, the Change which was made in the Government of our Church, was founded on *Prelacies being, and having been, a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to the Nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the generality of the People ever since the Reformation?* And on *this Churches being Reform'd by Presbyters?* Is it not on the same Supposition that some of our Brethren to this very Day do continue so confidently to maintain that it was so? And that our Reformers, in settling the Government of the Church, proceeded on the Principles of *Parity*? 'Tis true, indeed,

§. XLVIII.

IGNO-

IGNORANCE or Negligence, Prejudice or blind Partiality may induce Men to make very false Inferences, and draw very faulty Conclusions; even from the clearest and distinctest, the Solidest and most unquestionable Suppositions, as I am verily persuaded some have notoriously done in the same very Instance. But that does not in the least infer any real defect or weakness, any intrinsic unreasonableness or unserviceableness; nay, nor any considerable obscurity in the Supposition. Men who have latitude of Conscience, and suitable Doses of Willfulness, may *deny* the clearest and the fairest Suppositions, and they may *abuse* the most solid and reasonable Suppositions. What Supposition can be clearer or more unquestionable than that we may give Credit to our Senses about sensible Objects; especially when we have no reason to suspect any vitiation either of our Senses or the Medium; when the Senses of all Men, of Men of all Employments, of all Ages, of all Persuasions, of all Constitutions, of all Nations, &c. are consentient in their Testimonies about those Objects? And yet we know the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* cannot be maintain'd without a Contradiction to such a Supposition. Just so Men may *abuse* the fairest Suppositions by drawing ridiculous Consequences from them. Thus *Epicurus*, and after him *Lucretius*, from the unquestionable Supposition, That Men may give Credit to their Senses, drew this most ridiculous Inference, That the Sun was no broader than a broad Hat, or so. And what then? Shall this wildness or willfulness of Men who are not disposed for drawing just Consequences from reasonable Suppositions, hinder such as are every way duely disposed for it, to draw just Consequences from those Suppositions, and that with as much Assurance and Security as if never a wrong Consequence had been drawn from them? Certainly Men may draw wild Consequences from a Supposition, even while they had all the Reason in the World to judge it a most firm, a most solid, a most useful Supposition, even for clearing that same very *Phænomenon* about which they have actually Erred. Nor can their having erred afford them the least colour of a solid Reason for rejecting the Supposition after their Errour is discovered to them; especially if that Discovery is made by the just Use and Application of the Supposition. In such Cases, 'tis plain, 'twas not the Supposition that *Abused* them, but *they* that abused the Supposition

position by making it, which was so naturally and genuinely fitted for the discovery of Truth, subservient to the propagation of Error. This I thought fit to add, that the Reader may be satisfied, That the Errour of our Brethren about the *Principles* of our Reformers can be no just plea for the weakness or unserviceableness of the Supposition, That signal Matters of Fact may easily be traced for 150 Years.

MAY it not be added as another Argument, *ad Homines*, §. I. of the reasonableness of this Supposition, That tho' as much Evidence, as the nature of the thing is readily capable of, has been brought to prove, that our Brethren have notoriously mistaken the Principles of our Reformers; yet hitherto, rather than call in Question the reasonableness of such a Supposition, they have chosen, I shall not say, Obstinately, but I must say, very strangely, to maintain, in despite of all that Evidence, that they have still been in the right, in their Assertions concerning the Principles of our Reformers? This I am secure of,

WHAT ever others may Object against the sufficiency of §. LI. Tradition for handing down such notable Matters of Fact for 150 Years; G. R. my present Adversary, for shame can say nothing against it; at least, without grossly Contradicting himself he cannot call it in Question. For in his Preface to his Book which we have now under Consideration, he cites St. *Augustin* and *Primasius*, and he says that these two *African Bishops could not but know Cyprian's Mind*. Now it is certain that these two Bishops lived at a greater distance from St. *Cyprian* than St. *Cyprian* lived at from St. *John* the Apostle. St. *Augustin* died not before the Year 430, that is 172 Years after St. *Cyprian*. And *Primasius* was alive after the Year 450. And in his good old way Defended. (a) He is (a) Sect. 11. Angry at A. M. D. D. for affirming that Tradition is not §. 2. p. 267. to be believed or relied on if it exceeds 200 Years. This may suffer a little Correction (says he) and must not be taken for a Principle, neither on his (A. M. D. D's.) Authority, nor Du Launey's — It is hard to fix a Period how far Oral Tradition can hand down a Story to Posterity; especially if it be not about the Credenda of Religion. If I can believe a Story of 200 Years old, from a grave and wise Author whose veracity I do not question, I know not why the Addition of 50 or 100 Years more should make it incredible, if it come from the same Hand. Wherefore this is too peremptory a Decision. Here, you see, G. R. fairly
F pleads

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled

pleads for the *sufficiency* of even *Oral Tradition* for 300, that is twice 150 Years.

§. LII.

I HAVE insisted the more fully on this Advantage of the *Cyprianic Age*, not only to shew the reasonableness of my attempt to fix the *Principles* of that Age, but also, because it may be useful for some things I may afterwards have occasion to Discourse. (b) And now to bring all home to our present Purpose.

§. LIII.

IF such a notable and distinguishable Matter of Fact, as the Form of Church Government, settled by the Apostles may be clearly traced for 150 Years; if the Christians of the *Cyprianic Age* had all the Advantages that were needful for tracing that settlement; or (which is much the same) for discovering if any Substantial Innovations were made during such a Period of time; more especially, if *they*, living at much the same distance from the Times of the Apostles, at which *we* are from the Time of our Reformation, were by Parity of Reason in as good Circumstances for knowing the *Principles* on which the Apostles settled the Government of the Christian Churches, which they founded as *we*, at present, are in, for discovering the *Principles* on which our Reformers settled the Government of this Church when they Reformed it; if these things are so, I say, then it must needs follow, by very good Consequence, That the *fixing* of the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age* must be of very great usefulness for discovering the *Principles* on which the Apostles proceeded in Erecting the Government of Churches, whether they did it on those of *Parity* or *Imparity*.

§. LIV.

THESE six advantages (and perhaps many more) had the *Cyprianic Age*; and as it had these Advantages, so likewise

§. LV.

II. I was satisfied that the *fixing* of the true *Principles* of that Age, would most perfectly answer the Design of those three Considerations I have already accounted for, as the principal Argument which mov'd me to such an Undertaking.

§. LVI.

I. As for the first, (c) the Application is so plain that it needs not to be insisted on. For if there was plain *Imparity* between Bishops and Presbyters, if there was *proper Prelacy* lodg'd in the Persons of Bishops even with regard to Presbyters, what more can be needful for representing the *Uselessness* and the *Impertinency* of those Distinctions, even to the dull-est Apprehension? Especially when they are made use of for

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

27

for evacuating the force of the Testimonies of that Age? Much more when they are made use of for evacuating the Force of the Testimonies of later Ages; unless our Brethren are willing to part with one Assertion, which they use not to forget when they have occasion for it; namely, That the Power of *Prelats* after it once got footing, was still on the growing Hand. Farther yet, considering what I have said, if it can be made appear that there was proper *Prelacy* in the *Cyprianic Age*, it must needs follow, that the distinctions mention'd can never Evacuate the Force of the Testimonies even of the *Ages* that were Prior to the *Cyprianic Age*. I say, considering what I have said, *i. e.* so long as we have so much Reason to believe that those of the *Cyprianic Age* were far from *Innovating* or Proceeding on Principles different from the Principles of former Ages.

2. IF there was proper *Prelacy* in the *Cyprianic Age*, it §. LVII. must be as plain, not only that the Authors I cited in the second Consideration (d) have been very far wrong in their (d) §. 10. &c. Accounts, not only that they have exceedingly abused their to 26. credulous Disciples in a very momentous Point of Church History, but also, that all Persons who have any Love to Truth, and are not willing to have most false Accounts imposed upon them, ought hereafter to look on our *Scottish* Advocates for Presbytery as Persons very capable of advancing very false Propositions with very great Confidence. By consequence that they ought not to swallow down whatever is affirm'd by them, with whatsoever Confidence, without Examination. And if this could be obtain'd (and it seems to me very reasonable that it should) I could then cheerfully entertain the hopes that our Controversies about Church Government, which hitherto have produced such fatal Effects, might e'er long be brought to an happy Conclusion.

3. THE fixing of the Principles of that Age did likewise §. LVIII. seem to me very proper for determining (and that not by any far fetch'd Consequences) the Controversy above mention'd, (e) concerning the Principles of our Reformers with relation to Church Government. For that our Reformers laid down to themselves (and that very deliberately too) the afore said Rule of Reformation, namely the Scriptures as Interpreted by the Monuments and Practice of the primitive Church our Brethren dare not deny. It is recorded by their

own Prime Historian, who tells us that in one Petition, *An.* 1557. they addressed to the *Queen Regent* almost in the very terms of it, craving, *That the State Ecclesiastical might be Reformed according to the Rules and Precepts of the new Testament, the Writings of the ancient Fathers, and the godly and approved*

(f) Knox Hist. *Laws of Justinian the Emperour.* (f) and near to three Years p. 131. in 4to. after that, i. e. *An.* 1560. they proposed the same very Rule

to the Parliament, as that which they would stand by; viz. *The Word of God, the Practices of the Apostles, and the Sincerity*

(g) *ibid.* p. 261. *of the primitive Church.* (g) Is not this Argument enough, that this was their Rule, their Rule which again and again they had pondered? And now, may we not justly presume that our Reformers would have contented themselves with a Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Estate agreeable to the pattern of the *Cyprianic Age*? Nay, did not this their own Rule oblige them chearfully to accept of such a Reformation? Do they not expressly distinguish between the *Practices of the Apostles and the sincerity of the Primitive Church*? I ask therefore in what Age after the Apostles could they have found more of the Sincerity of the primitive Church than in that of *St. Cyprian*? In what Age during the first three Centuries, could they have found so full, so clear, so distinct Information concerning the ancient Constitution of Church Government? Of all Men on Earth, our Brethren can have least to say against this Consequence, so long as on the one Hand they continue to pretend such a deference to the Wisdom and Integrity of our Reformers; and on the other, That the State of the Church was not by far so much Corrupted in the *Cyprianic* as in after Ages, and particularly *Justinian's*.

§. LIX.

IV. BESIDES these Considerations I have hitherto insisted on, I had another which had some weight with me to determine me to such an Essay; namely, That all things, especially the abovemention'd Advantages of the *Cyprianic Age* consider'd, to fix the Principles of that Age, seem'd to me naturally to bring the main Controversy between us and our Brethren within a far narrower Compass than is usual. The Principles of that Age once well fixed, I say, seem'd to me to leave but very few other material Enquiries to be Discussed for ending the Controversy. Perhaps only these two, I. Whether there be any Evidence for any substantial Alteration in the Constitution of Church Govern-

Government between the *Apostolic* and *Cyprianic* Ages? 2. Whether the *Apostolic Writings* are *consistent* or *inconsistent* with the *Cyprianic Constitution*? This is plain, the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age* once fixed, 'tis perfectly needless for determining the Controversie, to launch out into the vast Ocean of *later Ages*. And certainly had *Gerfom Bucer*, *Salmasius*, *Blondel*, and many other Advocates on both sides, confin'd the Dispute within the limits of that Age (wherein the learnedest Presbyterians do acknowledge (b) Prelacy to have notoriously prevailed) and the preceding Ages, their Books might have been much less bulkish, and much more accurate; and so it had been much easier for such as had a mind for it, to try their Citations, and the solidity of their Reasonings from them.

THUS I have accounted for the Considerations which mov'd me to attempt the *Collecting* and *Digesting* of the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*. And I think G. R. by this time may see Reason to believe that however his rashness might have been the first thing that inclin'd me to such an attempt, and however the *Aspect* of my Book may seem to import that it was written of purpose to expose his *Rashness*, yet there were far more valuable Considerations at the bottom of it. And perhaps had I design'd it for a Publication, and finished it as it might have been finished, it might have appeared in another Form. But the Truth is, I had not design'd it for the Press, because, through want of Books, I was not in a Condition to finish it and make it so perfect as it might have been made.

How happen'd it then that it was Published? Thus, in short, I had learn'd that A. M. D.D. then at London, intended to publish something for the *Correction* and *Conviction* of the *Vindicator* of the *Kirk*: I therefore frankly made him the offer of my Papers, that if either my Thoughts or my Collection of Testimonies could be serviceable to him, he might make use of them. He as frankly entertain'd the offer. I sent my Papers to him. He having another opinion of them, it seems, than I had, did instantly, without ever acquainting me with it, put them in the Hands of Mr. Kettleby. So soon as I learn'd this from another Hand I was not a little surprized, considering the distance I then lived at from London, it was obvious to me that such a small number of Sheets would be sooner cast off, than that I could order for them such a Preface as they need-

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

needed. All I did therefore, was instantly to write to London, craving only that it might be told what Edition of St. Cyprian's Works I had made use of; namely that which was procur'd by the learned D. Fell, sometime Bishop of Oxford; and that one very short Amendment or rather Alteration might be made in my Papers. But the Book was Printed off before my Letter reached London, and so neither of the two was done.

§. LXII.

The Amendment I was desirous should have been made was of those Words which you have in the end of Page 35. *Nay, who may be such, and yet no Christian? For however inexpedient or indecent it may be that an Heathen should, on occasion, be the Moderator, &c.* into these, *Nay who may be such and yet no Church Officer? for however unusual it may be, that a meer Lay-man should on occasion be the Moderator, &c.* I could have been satisfied that this Alteration had been made; not that I think there is any great difficulty in Defending it as it was published against G. R. But because I was unwilling to have the least stroke in my Book that was not in appearance as well as really innocent. One thing is evident, viz. that tho' it was no ways Defensible, yet nothing of the stress of my Cause depends upon it.

§. LXIII.

I AM now satisfied that it had been reasonable to have made some other little Amendments; particularly one. It is said p. 65. that *perhaps besides Rogatianus, Britius and Numidicus, there were many more Presbyters at Carthage who would not join with Felicissimus.* Now that I have again consider'd the Matter, I am apt to think, there were at that time, no more Presbyters in Carthage than the aforesaid Three, and the Five who sided with Felicissimus. And so much concerning the Occasion, the Reasons of Writing, and the Publication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age.

C H A P.

CHAP. II.

This Vindication however simply unnecessary, yet in a manner needful for stopping the Mouths of our Presbyterian Brethren.

HAVING accounted for the Writing of the Principles §. I, of the Cyprianic Age in the preceding Chapter, I come now to account for my being at any pains to *Vindicate* them. And to tell Truth, I am affraid I shall have hard work in making it accountable; so little do they seem to need a *Vindication* against any thing G. R. has said in his Book. And indeed that there can be no great necessity of *Vindicating* them; and that I might very reasonably have declined to have any farther business with G. R. about them, may sufficiently appear from the following Considerations. And

I. BESIDES that he has indeed left all my Arguments §. II. in their full Force, as I am confident every competent Judge will acknowledge he has done; he has more than once, and more than one way, yielded all that I intended, *viz.* that there was real *Prelacy*, real *Imparity* of Power as well as *Honour* between *Bishop* and *Presbyter* in *St. Cyprian's* time.

HE has, I am sure, yielded it as far as plain shuffling §. III. and Tergiversation can be constructed to be yielding. He has said, that he never laid the stress of his Cause on the Practice or Principles of the Church after the Apostolic Age (a) I know (a) p. 2. §. 2. not what he may mean by his Cause: But it is plain that on the Principles of the Cyprianic Age he laid the stress of a Cause as weighty as his being or not being a *Schismatic* can amount to. And was this not the Cause he was mainly concern'd in, so far as my Book could make him concern'd? Neither shall he ever be able to make other than Tergiversation of what he has farther said (b) (b) p. 3. §. 3. *viz.* That *had* he imagined that so large a Book as mine would have been built on that Passage of his Defence of his second Vindication, which I took to task, He could have told me that tho' he might be bold to venture his Credit on the Cyprianic Age; and tho'

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled

tho' his Cause duly and distinctly stated, would suffer no loss by being tried at that Bar, yet he would not quit the more divine Letters Patents that he has for Presbytery, to rest in this, either as his only or his chief strength. This I say is arrant Tergiversation; for what can be plainer than that his Words in the Passage I examin'd cannot admit of any such Gloss? The Passage being but short, I shall here again Transcribe it; 'tis this,

§. IV.

ARG. 4th. Cyprian's Notion of Schism is when one Separateth from his own Bishop: This the Presbyterians do; Ergo A. All the strength of this Argument lieth in the sound of Words: A Bishop in Cyprian's time was not a Diocesan with sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination; if he prove that we shall give Cyprian and him leave to call us Schismatics. A Bishop then was the Pastor of a Flock, or the Moderator of a Presbytery. If he can prove that we Separate from our Pastors, or from the Presbytery, with their Moderator, under whose inspection we ought to be, let him call us what he will. But we disown the Bishops in Scotland from being our Bishops; we can neither own their Episcopal Authority nor any Pastoral relation that they have to us. These are his own Words and his own Points: And now judge if he laid not the stress of the Cause in which I engag'd with him, on the Principles of the Cyprianic Age; and if his Words are capable of admitting such a Gloss as he would put upon them. But this is not all.

§. V.

HE has undeniably granted that there was real Prelacy in St. Cyprian's time, or which is all one, that Presbyters then did not act in Parity with their Bishop, and that a Bishop then was truly more than a Presbyterian Moderator. This I say he has granted undeniably; I do not say plainly, for indeed he seems on some occasions to have been at pains to Word the Matter so Mystically and obscurely, as one who did not reverence his Age and Character would think he might safely Swear that there is gross Nonsense in the Case. And that which makes the Obscurity and Mysteriousness of his Language the more Observable is, that it is so most notoriously, when and where he complains that I had not stated the Controversie so plainly as was to be wished; and therefore he undertakes to State it more distinctly.

(c) p. 10. §. 9. We deny not, says he, (c) that in Cyprian's time there were SOME ADVANCES made towards SOME SORT of Prelacy; tho' the PARITY of POWER was not then WHOLLY taken away. What can be if this is not pure Mystery? For what
I pray

I pray can be the Sence of these Words. *There were some advances made towards some sort of Prelacy?* What Idea do they, can they represent to any Man's Understanding? If any at all, what else can it be but this, That in St. Cyprian's time, there was a Prelacy, even a Prelacy of Power? This appears from the next Words as much as any thing can appear from them. *Tho' the PARITY of POWER was not then WHOLLY taken away.* If this, I say, have any Sence at all, must it not be, that in St. Cyprian's time the Parity of Power was IN PART taken away, tho' not WHOLLY? I said if it have any Sence at all; for to my Understanding, if you take the least imaginable Part from Parity, you shall forthwith have Imparity. If you take unequal Parts from Equals, what remains must be unequal, to me, is every whit as true, as if you take equal Parts from Equals, what remains must be Equal. When I read Simplicius's Commentarie on the 33d Chapter of Epictetus, it never entred into my Head to quarrel with him for reckoning it as much a common Notion, That *that which is Equal neither exceeds nor is exceeded, as that twice two make four.* In short, I have always thought that Parity consisted in Indivisibili; nor do I expect ever to understand how the distinction of WHOLLY and in PART can be applicable to it. Briefly, let G. R. if he can make Sence of what he has here said, otherwise than by granting that, in St. Cyprian's time the Parity of Power *was* taken away.

THAT this is all the Sence that can be made of it seems farther clear from what he immediately subjoins, viz. That the Mystery of Iniquity, as in other things, so in that, did begin early to work, even in the Days of the Apostles, when Diotrephes did φιλομαρτυρεῖν, affected to be Primus Presbyter, or Πρεσβυς, or Moderator, in their Meetings: That this πρεσβυαία becoming fixed and constant, after the Apostles times (these good Men not foreseeing the ill use that others would make of that Handle given them) it did by insensible degrees degenerate into an undue Usurpation; as it is hard to get Power kept within its due Bounds, even among the best Men. And that thus the primitive Power of Presbyters was gradually wrested out of their Hands by the Ambition of some, and by the innocent Simplicity of others. All this, I say, seems to make it clear that what I have said, was the true meaning of his Mysterious Language. And it seems farther clear from what yet follows; at least as far as one Mysterious Period can bring Light to another. Many other Corruptions, says he, had

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled

crept into the Church by that time; and the Declension from ABSOLUTE PARITY went along with them. The Name Ἐπίσκοπος began to be appropriat to the Πρεσβυς; and that Custom being confirmed by a little time, made even humble Men imagine that some different Power was signified by that Name that they had distinct from others; which the rest who were so usurped upon did too easily yield; minding more the work of Feeding than of Ruling the Flock; and not seeing the fatal Consequents of it, which afterward appeared, and were not discovered till it was too late to retrieve them.

§. VII.

In which Period, I say, we have more Mystery. So I must reckon of it till G. R. shall explain what he means by ABSOLUTE PARITY, and tell what is the other Member of the distinction that may be reasonably set in opposition to it. I know there are divers Terms which such as are cleaver at distinguishing use as they have occasion to oppose to ABSOLUTE; such as *Dependent, Accountable, Imperfect, Relative, Conditional, &c.* But I cannot find any one of them that may answer to ABSOLUTE when it is join'd to PARITY. But I am willing to be as easie to G. R. as I can, and therefore I shall press this no farther, if he will but grant (that which I think any reasonable Man would grant, viz.) That every DECLENSION from PARITY, whether ABSOLUTE or NOT ABSOLUTE must necessarily result into an IMPARITY.

§. VIII.

THE rest of this Period, if not as good Mystery, is however as pleasant, and as useful for our present Purpose. The appropriation of the name Ἐπίσκοπος (*Bishop*) to the Πρεσβυς (*Moderator*) and a little time's Confirmation of that Custom, made even humble men imagine that some different Power was signified by that Name, that they had distinct from others, &c. what can be more pleasant? Is not this the plain meaning, That tho' Bishops look'd on themselves, and were look'd on by Presbyters as having more Power than Presbyters in St. Cyprian's time, yet they had it not? And it was a Mistake in both Bishops and Presbyters that they thought so? That this is the meaning, seems farther plain from G. R's. frequent Repetition of this fine Speculation. For, §. 25. (d) He says, *It was lamentable that the Episcopal Promotion began then* (when the Controversie was between Cornelius and Novatianus about the Chair of Rome) *to be more esteem'd than was meet, and was LOOKT on as a Prelation above the other Brethren.* And §.

(d) p. 30.

53. (e) *It was the Genius of that Age to have too big thoughts* (e) p. 79. of that *Prelation of being primus Presbyter*: And the best of Men, in that time, were *tingur'd with this Mistake*, i. e. good Men? They thought there was *Prelacy* amongst them: but in was not so for all that. Now it is unavoidable that either this, however Ridiculous, must be G. R.'s Meaning, or that even in those times there was *manifest Imparity*, tho' he was unwilling to speak it out plainly.

IT were easie to adduce more of his Concessions to this §. IX. Purpose: Thus §. 20. (f) He grants that a *Bishop in those* (f) p. 24. times, by reason of his fixation in that Office, and by Custom had crept into **SOME MORE POWER** over the College of Presbyters than was due. Now, if CREEPING must be the Word, I would only gladly know how he could have crept into some more Power than was due, without creeping into an *Imparity of Power*? Once more §. 44. (g) answering the (g) p. 61. Argument I had brought, for the Bishops Power of Ordination, taken from the Instance of *Fabianus* his *Ordaining Novatianus* a *Presbyter*, not only without the consent, but against the Inclinations of both Clergy and People; he says *it was the practice of an aspiring Pope*. It is not my Business at present to chastise G. R., for so uncharitably bestowing such an ill founding Name on that excellent Person; tho' it were very easie to do it. And I believe G. R. is the first Man that ever attempted to diminish the *Honour* of his *Memory*. All I am concern'd for is to desire the Reader to judge whether it is not more than probable that G. R. when he pronounc'd him an *aspiring Pope*, had some other *Idea* in his Head than that of either single *Presbyter* or *Presbyterian Moderator*? or rather, that he had the *Idea* of something more and greater than an *ordinary Diocesan Bishop*?

DIVERS other such Concessions of his might be ad- §. X. duced, by which he has fairly granted all I pleaded for: But these may be sufficient, especially when, besides those Concessions, all along through his whole Book, he has been forc'd, for avoiding the dint of my Arguments, to flee to the sorry Plea of the *Sole Power of Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*, &c. And now what need of Vindicating my Book, when my Adversary has so fully and so frequently yeilded all it was design'd for? But this is not all, For

II. A JUDICIOUS and attentive Reader may easily find §. XI. it more than probable that G. R. has applied himself to

write his *Cyprianic Bishop examined*, without having read the not very voluminous Works (as he calls them) of St. *Cyprian*. That he had not read them over before he wrote that Paragraph in his *Defence* of his *Second Vindication*, which gave occasion to my Book, seems clear enough. For how can any thinking Man imagine that G. R. would have been so inadvertant, had he been acquainted with St. *Cyprian*? Besides, I have it very credibly, That when first my Book came to his Hands, he went to the *Library* of his College, and called for St. *Cyprian's* Works: And when the *Keeper* produced them, of *Pamelius* his Edition, (none of the smallest Volumes in which they have been published) He was surprized, and ask'd if these were all St. *Cyprian's* Writings? were there no more Volumes of them in the Library? Now let the Reader judge if this look'd like one of St. *Cyprian's* Acquaintances. Did it not rather look like one who had imagined that I could not have adduced so many Citations, but from such Voluminous Authors as St. *Austin* or St. *Chrysostom*?

§. XII.

BUT are there any shrewd Presumptions that he had not Read St. *Cyprian* before he wrote his *Cyprianic Bishop examined*? One would think that it were scarcely to be imagined that had he read St. *Cyprian*, he could have had the Resolution to have written such a Book. It may be likewise thought that, considering all his Functions (for G. R. is not only *Principal* of the College, but also a *Minister* in *Edenburgh*, and has a very large Parish) he had scarcely time to read him accurately, and withal write his Book so soon as he wrote it. But these I do not, I need not insist on, having so many fair Arguments in his Book: Arguments which want no more to make them Demonstrations, but one Supposition, which, I am hopeful he will readily grant, this, That he is a Man of *common Sense* and *common Ingenuity*: These supposed, I have these Arguments.

§. XIII.

I HAD Cited St. *Cyprian's* 7th, 34th, 45th and 59th Epistles to prove that there were *Acolyths* in St. *Cyprian's* time. (b) And G. R. says (i) he was at the pains to read over all those Epistles of *Pamelius's* Edition; but did not find one Word of *Acolyths* in any of them; and so he leaves the Matter, as if I had had no Ground to cite St. *Cyprian's* Authority for *Acolyths*. Now if he had read over all St. *Cyprian's* Epistles even of *Pamelius's* Edition he could not have missed

(b) p. 5.

(i) p. 17. §. 13.

missed those very accounts of *Acolyths* which I had given, in Ep. 36. 28. 42. 55. according to *Pamelius's* Numbers. But if he had found them in those Epistles, would not common Ingenuity have obliged him to have confess'd he had found them, tho' not in the Epistles, as I had numbred them ? again.

I HAD, (upon occasion) Cited St. Cyprian calling the Episcopal Degree, *The sublime top of the Priesthood* : and G. R. Answers (k) To Cyprian's word's, the Sublime top of the Priesthood, (b) §. 21. p. I should not doubt to give a satisfying Answer, if I could find the place, and consider the purpose he is speaking of : But my Antagonist (says he) hath made my work very difficult by leaving me at uncertainties where to find any one of his Citations, unless I either STUMBLE on them CASUALLY, or read ALL St. Cyprian's Epistles for every place that is cited. Now, supposing G. R. to be a Man of common Sense, it cannot be imagined that he meant that he could not find all my Citations, unless he had read over all St. Cyprian's Writings as many times as I had adduced Citations from them, i. e. divers Hundreds of times. No doubt G. R. knows very well that any Man of any Head, with an ordinary Attention, might have tried all my Citations, if not at the first, yet doubtless at the second or third reading over of St. Cyprian's Writings, so that his plain meaning must needs be, That he could not find them unless he either STUMBLED on them CASUALLY (which was not indeed to have been expected) or should have read all over St. Cyprian's Writings for them. And if this be his meaning, then 'tis plain, he had not read them all over. Farther,

HE says §. 23. (l) that after search, he cannot find where it is said that Sabinus was Ordained Successor to Basilides, by Imposition of Hands : But if he had read Ep. 68. according to *Pamelius*, he had certainly found it. §. 33. (m) He cannot find these Words *Cathedram sibi Constituere & Primatum assumere*, by any direction I had given him ; and therefore he cannot tell what might be said for Vindicating them. Now *Pamelius* has them Ep. 76. Again, §. 46. (n) he says, he can find nothing in Ep. 62. and 78. concerning the Bishop's Power of imposing Charitable Contributions on his People, &c. And true it is, according to *Pamelius's* Numbers, there is nothing to that purpose in those Ep. But had he read Ep. 60. and 79. common Ingenuity would have compelled him to have confess'd he found it in them. And §. 46. (o) he says, he knows no more

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled

more where to find the places of Scripture on which I had said, The Bishops power of disposing of the Revenues of the Church seem'd fairly to be founded, than he knows where to find some places of Cyprian which I had cited. Now I did expressly direct him to Mr. Dodwell's first Cyprianic Dissertation §. 9. for finding a Text fairly so interpreted, viz. 1 Pet. 5. 2. But that is not the present Matter. It is, that here we have a fair Confession, That he had no more read over all St. Cyprian's Works for finding my Citations, than he had the New Testament for finding those Scriptures. Once more.

§. XVI.

(p) p. 37.

HAVING told §. 29. (p) that I had brought some Citations, that needed a little to be examin'd, he goes on thus, *Altho' I can by no diligence find some of the places that he citeth, yet by CHANCE I have light on these.* Now certainly the easie Diligence of reading over all St. Cyprian's Works, with an ordinary Attention (as I have said) might have afforded him every one of them. But this it seems was too laborious a Diligence for G. R. All the Diligence he had used could not have discovered to him even those few Testimonies which I had adduc'd for proving that by the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, the Bishop was the Principle of Unity to all the Christians within his District. He had not found them at all, if kind and helpful CHANCE had not cast them up to him. By this time the Reader may judge whether G. R. had read St. Cyprian's Writings, before he wrote his *Cyprianic Bishops examined*; and by consequence, whether there can be any great necessity of a Reply to him.

§. XVII.

(q) Cap. i. §. 6.

AS for his frequent Complaints, That I did not tell him what Edition of St. Cyprian's Works I had made use of; besides that I have sufficiently accounted for that already; (q) I must farther tell him that his Ignorance of the Edition I made use of, is no great Argument of his curiosity to know the best Editions of Books. I made use of the incomparably best Edition of St. Cyprian: The Edition ordered by the Learned D. Fell, and adorned by him with excellent Notes. The Edition in order to which, the great Doctor Pearson wrote that admirable Piece of Learning, *Annales Cyprianici*, in which he reduced all St. Cyprian's Works, especially his Epistles to the proper Years, some to the proper Months in which they were written; and the incomparable M. Dodwell wrote his *Dissertationes Cyprianicae*. The Edi-

Edition which had its first Impression at Oxford, An. 1682. A second at Breme, 1690. and a third at Amsterdam 1691, at both these places, with such regard to the Oxford Impression, and to the conveniency of finding Citations in any Impression of that Edition, that (if I remember right) they have Religiously kept by the same number of Pages, nay of Lines with the Oxford Impression. At both places having annex'd to St. Cyprian's Works, (besides divers Tractates falsely attributed to him) both the abovemention'd Books, The *Annales Cyprianici*, and *Dissertationes Cyprianicæ*. In short, an Edition famous all Europe over; particularly accounted for and commended not only by the Learned D. Cave in his *Historia Literaria*; not only by the *Fasti Oxonienses*; but also by Du Pin in his *Bibliotheca Patrum*; nay, even by G. R's. Friend Spanhemius in his *Introduction to Church History*, (r) Lastly, an Edition which had all these Impres- (r) Edit 1689. sions, and Praises and Commendations, and perhaps many p. 134. more, long before I had thought of having any Controversie with G. R. about his being a Schismatick by the Cyprianic Principles. And now to return to my Thread. what necessity can there be of a Reply to G. R. who has so fairly yielded all I pleaded for, and who has never read St. Cyprian?

3. But there are other Considerations besides these two, §, XVIII. which may justly make it seem needless to have any farther Dealing with G. R. particularly, his inhumane Dealing with me. I shall not insist on trifling Incivilities, such as his calling me *Confident* at every turn, and twenty more of that Nature; nay, I shall not much insist on that which perhaps he intended for a Compliment, (s) tho' it be one (s) p. 1.] of the Sourest and most unpallatable ones I have met with, namely, *That my Book was written in a more Schollar like, and less unchristian strain than any he had before seen from Men of my Persuasion.* What for a Compliment is it thus to tell one that he Writes *Unchristianly*? And is it not plainly implied that I had written *Unchristianly*, when it is said that I had only written in a *less Unchristian Strain* than others? Is not less *unchristian* still *unchristian*? And the Complement is still the sower, when it is considered that that which only could smell of Compliment in it, viz. That I had written *Schollar-like* is afterwards explained by him to have truly signified that I had written like a *School-Boy*; for I had translated

(t) p. 64.

stated a Saying of St. Cyprian's, otherwise, it seems, than G. R. would have had it done; and therefore he says, *If a School-Boy should make such a version of Latin into English, he would be laught for it.* (t) All this I can easily digest, especially the making me a *School-Boy*; For, indeed, However I have dared to tug a little with G. R. yet I am sensible I ought to pass for no better than a *School-Boy* among Men of Learning. Only, if I am a *School-Boy*, it must contribute very little for G. R's. Honour, if he shall defeat me, and less, if he shall be defeated by me. But enough of this.

§. XIX.

(u) p. 4.

THAT which I mainly aim at in this Consideration, is G. R's. Inhumanity towards me in Matters of greater Moment than undervaluing, or ungraceful Complement can amount to. He has divers times endeavoured to make me a *Papist*; but this I shall afterwards consider; nay, in effect he has made me little better than an *Atheist*: For he has plainly affirm'd *That 'tis much more my Inclination to Write Ad Hominem, against a particular Person, (i. e. himself) than Ad Rem, for that which I take to be the Truth of God.* (u) now how rankly must he smell of *Atheism* who prefers such a pitiful and sorry Victory as can be obtain'd over such a one as G. R. to the Truth, that is in effect, to the glory of God? Neither had G. R. so much as the least Colour of ground for such an Assertion. 'Tis true indeed, he attempts to squeeze it from my having waved to enter into the main Controversie between the *Prelatists* and the *Presbyterians*, and my having only endeavoured to Chastize his Rashness in my Book. But he might, with as much Reason, have inferred thence, that I was a *Presbyterian*. There had been every way as good a Connexion between the Premises and the Conclusion. For by what imaginable Consequence, or Chain of Consequences can it follow, That one puts a higher value on one thing than another, because he chuses to begin with it in his Order of Writing? Again, may not one at once write *ad Hominem* and *ad Rem* too? against a particular Person, and for the Truth of God? Is there any Truth which is not God's Truth? Whose then is it? And then, I am sure it is not God's Truth, (for it is not Truth at all) that I waved to enter into the main Controversie; unless G. R. can prove that Delaying is Waving; nay, unless he can prove that I may be justly said to have waved a thing, when I had expressly undertaken to Discourse

course that thing so soon as he to whom my Letter was Directed should Command me. (v) But this is not all. (v) See Prin. Cyp. Age. p. 94.

G. R. has not only thus Endeavoured to expose me as §. XX. one of no Religion, or at best, of a very bad one; but he has more than once or twice ascribed positions to me which it is impossible for him to prove to have been mine. Thus §. 10. (w) He says, that *I pleaded that Episcopal Power was not only acted by some, but generally, in the Churches of the First, Second and Third Centuries, and approved by general Consent.* I do now tell him that I see no danger in asserting that Episcopal Government was instituted by the Apostles, and did prevail in all duly Constituted Churches in part of the First, and thro' all the Second and Third Centuries; nay, I verily believe it to be true: But I am very sure there is no such Assertion, in *Terminis*, in all my Book. And I am as sure that the Purpose of my Book did not require any such Assertion. Again, §. 36. (x) he says, *That I pretend to no less Antiquity for my way, than from the Apostles, downward, yea all the Ages of the Church, and all the Churches of every Age.* Now, it is certain, I never said so; I could not say so till I had first resolved to be both Unconscientious and Ridiculous, without any shadow of Necessity. For, before I wrote my Book I knew (what all Christendom knows) that there have been some Churches, in some Ages, without Bishops; particularly many, both in this Age and the last. If such Imputations are not Arguments of Injustice, certainly they are of Inaccuracy in G. R. But these are not the worst. For

WHAT can be more notoriously an Imposition on his §. XXI. Reader, as well as an Act of Injustice to me, than that which he has §. 26. (y) where he says, *That I will say that the Elders of Ephesus, whom the Apostle warns Act. 20. 30. were Diocesan Bishops?* Who told him that I would say so? Had I given him any ground to imagine that I would say so in any Page, or Line, or Syllable of all my Book? And now, to convince even G. R. himself, that he affirm'd this at Random, I do declare, I will not say, That those Elders were Diocesan Bishops. Again, §. 48. (z) he says, that I do call all *Presbyters the Bishops Curates.* Now, tho' I see neither grievous Harm, nor great Heresie in calling them so, yet if I called them so, in any part of my Book, I am satisfied that it be burnt, with disgrace, by the Hand of the common Hang-

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

man, at the Cross of *Edinburg*. He has divers other such false Assertions of me in his Book, which, for brevity, I shall forbear to take notice of: Only

§. XXI.

ONE more of such his notorious Injustices I cannot neglect, because it is of great Consideration in our main Controversie. It is that all along he makes me to maintain That the **SOLE POWER** of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction* is lodged in the Person of the Bishop. This he has at least ten times over in his Book. More than once he makes me an

(a) p. 21. § 17. Assertor of this **SOLITUDE** of Power (as he calls it) (a) with a Witness, *e. g.* I had affirm'd that every Church in *St. Cyprian's* time was ruled by a Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons. And I observe, says G. R. §. 14 (b) *our Authors unwaryness in here asserting that the Church was Ruled by Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, and yet he pleadeth for the SOLE JURISDICTION of the Bishop in most part of his Book. This I impute to the want of a good Memory.* And §. 17. (c) *All this,* says he, (that is all he had taken notice of a little before) *tendeth to prove the Bishops SOLE JURISDICTION which is afterwards to be considered, when he insisteth on that point ON PURPOSE.*

(d) p. 80.

(e) Ep. 30.

(f) p. 82.

So that it seems there is some part of my Book in which, of set purpose, I undertook to maintain the Bishops sole Jurisdiction. And §. 54. (d) he says that in the return that the Presbytery at *Rome* made to *St. Cyprian* (e) *I fancied that I might find some Arguments for Episcopal SOLE POWER, &c.* And §. 55. (f) he hath the same Assertion over again. Now, when an Ingenuous and Honest Reader, who expects no Tricks, observes these and the like Passages, what wonder if he believes that I had appeared a zealous Advocate for the Sole Jurisdiction of Bishops? And yet, not only is there not so much as one Syllable in all my Book to that purpose; but on the contrary, I was at all the pains I could to shew that I was not to plead for the Bishops **SOLE POWER** of either Jurisdiction or Ordination. But of this more fully hereafter, all I mention'd it for at present was, That the Reader may see how unfairly G. R. has dealt with me in this Matter. And now to bring home this whole Consideration to the purpose for which I design'd it.

§. XXIII.

CAN any great necessity lye on one to give any farther Answer to G. R.'s Book than even to make such a Discovery as I have made of his Inhumanity and unfair Dealing in it? Is it not presumeable that he has found him-
self

self sadly straitned, when he was forc'd to betake himself to such unmanly and disingenuous Shifts? tho' I had treated him either rudely or unfairly, it could not have justified such Counter-treatment. No Retaliation but the Innocent can be justifiable. My sinning against him could never have Legitimated his Sinning against me. But indeed I did neither treat him unfairly nor rudely. I dealt so fairly with him, that I did set down his own Words, and gave such a natural Paraphrase on them, as he himself was forc'd to say, (g) *He had little to observe on it; and that he was ready to maintain all that I had made to be his Opinion*, except one thing, which yet may be made to appear to be his with all the Evidence the Nature of the thing is capable of. I no where treated him rudely. He himself seems not to have found, in all my Book (except that it was at all written) any thing save one that could awaken his Resentment. In a certain Book of his, he had insinuated that it was Pride in St. Cyprian that had made him write so to his Presbyters, as he had done on some Occasions. I had adduced enough of Argument to purge the holy Martyr of that most heinous Sin; and then subjoin'd these Words (b) *what I have said, me* (b) p. 63. *thinks might be enough in all Conscience for defeating for ever that Uncharitable, shall I say? or Ignorant Suggestion, That it was Pride perhaps that prompted Cyprian to write so Magisterially, &c.* This, I say, seems a little to have awaken'd G. R.'s Relentment (i) (i) p. 18. I shall not say but it might have been otherwise worded: But I can assure him it was my Tenderness of him that inclined me to impute the Antichristian Character he had bestowed on the holy Man, rather to his Ignorance than to his Uncharitableness; for I did, and still do think, the former a far more innocent cause than the latter. This, as I have said, was all, in all my Book that G. R. would catch at, as importing rudeness to him. It is plain therefore, That it has been nothing in my Book, nothing, I say, but meer force of Argument that has irritated him to treat me so unhand somely: And this Consideration, as I have said, tho' there were no other to be added to the former two, may justly make it seem unnecessary to give him any farther Reply. But indeed there are others every whit as weighty. Particularly.

IV. HE has given so many remarkable instances of his §. XXIV. weakness at Reasoning as may make it seem reasonable to

(k) p. 35.

forbear to meddle more with him. I take the great Design of writing Books to be that others may be inform'd and bettered by them. Now, certainly it very seldom happens that much of those Fruits is to be gathered, where all one has to do, is to shew anothers Weakness or Inadvertencies. And therefore, even where such Undertakings may seem necessary, yet the quicker dispatch the better. So that I shall only give a Specimen of such Work at present. And I think I cannot begin with a pleasanter instance than that which he has §. 27. (k) There accounting for the Causes which (in his Opinion) *made the Fathers overlash* (as he Words it) *in their Invectives against Schism*. He names only these two, *Holy Zeal* and *excellent Rhetorick*. It is well known, says he, *that the HOLY ZEAL of the Fathers, and the EXCELLENT RHETORICK they were endowed with, made them overlash sometimes in their Expressions*. Considering the Controversie G. R. was engag'd in, it was indeed his Interest to extenuate the Sin of *Schism* (if it can possibly be any Man's interest to extenuate any Sin, and not rather to confess it and forsake it) and that it should not appear so black as the Fathers do unanimously make it: So that, had he imputed their Bitterness against it to BLIND ZEAL or PAINT-ED SOPHISTRY, he had but serv'd that Interest: But I must leave it to him who can, to comprehend how *Holy Zeal* and *excellent Rhetorick* should have produc'd such a bad Effect as an unjust Condemnation of *Schism*. Again.

§. XXV.

(l) §. 28. p. 37.

2. It is very observable (says he) (l) that Cyprian Ep. 33. says that Ecclesia in Episcopo & Clero & omnibus stantibus est Constituta. That the Church is settled in the Bishop, the Clergy, and all the Faithful. Now would you know why this is so observable? Why? It proves this observable Proposition, *It is not the Bishop that is the Church*. And now was it not indeed very observable? for certainly it proves the weighty Proposition to a Demonstration. Again,

§. XXVI.

(m) §. 33. p. 42.

3. I HAD Asserted that by the Cyprianic Principles, all Bishops were equal, from which G. R. gains a mighty Corollary. Take it in his own Words (m) I insist not on his first Proposition, says he, concerning the Equality of Bishops; I only observe, that he is for Parity in the Church; and if it be found among Bishops, I know no Scripture nor Reason that Condemneth it among Presbyters. And truly neither do I.

4. HAVING adduced Two Testimonies from Firmilian's Epistle to St. Cyprian (n) to prove that he was a full Declarer for Presbyterian Government, he subjoins thus, *It is to be observed that frequent mention is made in this Epistle of Episcopi, Bishops; and Pamelius thinking that this Epistle being turned out of the Greek into Latine by Cyprian, to whom it was written, by Præpositus is meant Bishop, and by Senior, Presbyter; whence it is evident, that here all Church Power is ascribed to the Presbyter that is given to the Prepositus or Bishop. And so by plain Demonstration, we have Pamelius a Presbyterian. For what Demonstration can be plainer than that he who will have Prepositus to signifie Bishop, and Senior, Presbyter, is for Parity between Bishops and Presbyters.*

5. HE adduces Jerome's Testimony, *Alexandria à Marco Evangelista usq; ad Heraclam & Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori Gradu collocatum Episcopum Nominabant*: Now it is not his dishonesty in leaving out the immediately succeeding Words, *Quomodo si Exercitus Imperatorem faciat, &c.* that I challenge, because the producing of them would have marr'd his whole Plot; neither is it that he says *it may fairly be deduced hence that till Anno Christi 246. all the Power or Authority that the Bishop had was given him by the Presbyters*; tho' even in this he is pleasant enough in point of Chronology (as if Heraclas had not been Bishop of Alexandria before the Year 246.) and in point of Reasoning too, as if it were an unquestionable inference: Tho' Presbyters had the Power of choosing and Nominating their Bishop, E, The Bishop had all his Power and Authority from them, but that which I take notice of, is this good Collection, *If then the Presbyters made a Bishop, it could not be he alone, but the Bishop with them, and as one of them, the Presbyters, who made Presbyters* (o) who dares be so pert as to say that this is no good Consequence? (o) §. 40. p. 55.

6. MUCH like to this, and it may bring more light to it if it needs it, is his Reasoning §. 42. (p) I had affirm'd that it was *Easiness and Condescension* in St. Cyprian, That he consulted his Clergy in the matter of Ordinations; and G. R. says, *this is inconsistent with what I say elsewhere, viz. That the Bishop was a Monarch, and the Presbytery his Senate: I hope, says he, He, i. e. I, will not say that it is ex beneplacito that King's Consult their Parliaments, unless he be for the Turkish Government both in Church and State.* Now here

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

G. R. has certainly nick'd me by native nimbleness at Reasoning; for the point is about giving Commissions to Inferiour Officers: And now, whatever come of the *Turkishness* of Government, whether in Church or State I do confess, I have no Reason to say that it is *ex beneplacito* that our Kings Consult their Parliaments about granting Commissions to Inferiour Officers, in either Civil or Military Employments; because tho' Thousands of such Commissions have been granted by such Kings as we have had, since I remember, yet I do not remember that ever any of these Kings did at all consult their Parliaments about any of those Commissions, but gave them all without such Consultation.

§. XXX.

7. IT is every whit as good Reasoning which he has §. 44. *That the Contentions that are about the number of the Canons commonly called Apostolic, make them all to be suspected.* Only let the Canonical Books of Scripture see to it; unless there has never been any Contention about the Number of them. And

§. XXXI.

8. IN that same §. he says, that *my Comparison of the Bishops Power with the Rights of Majesty, in giving Commissions, is vain talk; unless I can prove a Monarchy and that Absolute, in the Church.* Right! Sir, for who can doubt that in a *limited Monarchy*, it is impossible it should be one of the Rights of Majesty to grant Commissions.

§. XXXII.

9. *One thing he cannot pass (ibid) namely, my saying that after St. Cyprian's time, it was appointed by the Canons that Presbyters should concur with Bishops in Ordinations.* Why could he not pass this? Because *scilicet* (p. 62.) *it overthrew all my Discourse of the Bishops Majesty, Sovereignty Incontrotable Power, unaccountable Power, &c.* Now, let him who can, find out the necessity of this Consequence for my part, I cannot: Only, if Kings can discover it, it may be their Wisdom, hereafter, to bethink themselves, before they admit of the Concurrence of their People either to the making or Executing Laws; for if they do, good Morrow to their Majesty and Sovereignty, as well as to their Incontrotable and Unaccountableness.

§. XXXIII.

10. FROM my saying that *Numidicus* was probably Ordain'd a Presbyter, before St. Cyprian join'd him to the Presbytery of Carthage: G. R. inle's (q) thus. *If Numidicus was Ordain'd before, then he was also placed in Carthage before.* That is, if *Numidicus* was ordain'd before St. Cyprian join'd

join'd him to the Presbytery of *Carthage*, then he was also placed in *Carthage* before he was join'd to the Presbytery of *Carthage*. Good! if G. R. was ordain'd a Presbyter before the Year 1660, then was he a Presbyter of *Edinburgh* before the Year 1660. as good.

11. I HAD adduced the Testimony of the Roman Confessors who had forsaken *Novatianus*, and returned to the Unity of the Church, to prove that they own'd *Cornelius* to be *Superiour* to his Clergy; because they expressly distinguish between him and his Clergy, in these Words of their Epistle to St. Cyprian (r) *we are reconcil'd to Cornelius OUR BISHOP, and to all the Clergy*. Consider now what Advantage G. R. makes of this by his Dexterity at drawing Consequences. (s) *As if he had design'd to refute himself*, says he, *He citeth a Letter of these Persons, shewing that they were reconciled to the Bishop and to the whole Clergy, where is then the Bishops SOLE POWER of reconciling Penitents?* Now, it is not his making me to plead for the Bishops sole Power of reconciling Penitents, tho' (as I have said, and shall have occasion to say again) I never pleaded for any such thing, but his accurate Reasoning, that I take notice of. For why might not the Bishop have had the *Sole Power* of Reconciling, i. e. of Authoritatively and Judicially Absolving Penitents, notwithstanding any thing contain'd in that Epistle? Can their saying that they had made their Peace with the Clergy hinder it? if so, then the People had their share of the Authoritative Reconciliation of Penitents; for they say, they made that Peace *with the Joy and good liking of all the People*. (t) so that, the Power of Reconciling was not SOLELY, no not in both Bishop and Clergy. Nay, by this way of Reasoning, the *sole Power* of Reconciling Penitents was not in the Bishop, Clergy and People, all taken together, of any particular Church; but in all the Bishops and all the Clergy, and all the People of the Church Catholick. For here it lies; all those had a share of the Power of Reconciling, with whom the Absolved were Reconciled. Now it is certain that by the Principles of those times, whosoever was Reconciled to his Bishop, was Reconciled to the whole Church Catholick. Once more

12. I HAD said that St. Cyprian, while in his Retirement had delegated *Caldonius* and *Herculanus* two Bishops, to order some Affairs relating to the Church of *Carthage*: Here now,

§. XXXIV.

(r) cum Cornelio Episcopo NOSTRO pariter & cum universo Clero pacem fecisse. Ep. 53. p. 98.

(s) §. 47. p. 68.

(t) Cum Gaudio etiam universæ Ecclesiæ, prona etiam omnium Charitate. ibid.

§. XXXV.

(u) § 47. p. 69. now, how G. R. makes his advantage hereof. (u) If *this Discourse prove such a Power of Delegation, it will also prove such a Power in one Bishop over another, which our Author will not allow, &c.* In short, as he reasons the Matter, a Bishop's Power to Delegate another Bishop to order any Matter for him, gives the Delegating a Power over the Delegated, and by Consequence, quite destroys the Original Equality of Bishops. How happy is that party that has such a Master at Reasoning for their *Champion*? Only G. R's. Collegues in *Edenburgh*, next time he goes to *Court*, about the weighty Matters of the *Kirk*, may do well to take heed that none of them receive a Letter from him desiring them to order any Matters in his Parish; for if they do, and do obey the Desire of that Letter, They have seen their *Last* of Presbyterian Parity: They have e'en given G. R. a power over them, and made him a Bishop. But is there no Remedy? Courage Brethren! G. R. may even Delegate you, for all that, and yet acquire no Power over you: For he tells you in the very next Words *that sending a Messenger to do for us, what we are restrain'd from doing, is not always an Act of Authority: One Friend may send another, if he yield to it, as well as a Master may send his Servant.* Now certainly this is very true in one Sense *i.e.* it is not indeed an Act of Authority over the Person sent or Delegated; and so the Original Equality of Bishops is *Wind tight* and *Water tight*, notwithstanding the Delegation St. Cyprian gave to *Caldonius* and *Herculanus*. But then it is as certainly false in another Sense, (the only Sense in which the Truth of it could have been useful to G. R.) *viz.* That it is not always an Act of Authority over the Church in which the Matter or Matters are to be ordered by virtue of that Delegation.

§. XXXVI. BY this time, the Reader has got a full dozen of Instances of G. R's. Abilities at Reasoning. It had been a very easie task to have Tripled the Number; but I am not willing to turn the Readers Stomach. These I have adduced may be sufficient for my purpose, which was to shew what little Necessity G. R's. Abilities that way can lay on one to give him any Laborious Reply. Neither

§. XXXVII. V. HAS he shewn such either Skill or Accuracy, or Ingenuity, in the Matter of Books or reading, as can inter any such Necessity. Indeed, there is scarcely one Author cited by him, in all his Book, which might not afford Reflections on some

some one or more of those his Qualities. But it is not my purpose, on this Consideration, to call him to an Account for all his *Lame*, or his *Impertinent*, or his *Wrested*, or his *false Citations*. That which I do now aim at, is chiefly his *Skill* in his *Accounts*, his *Censures*, and his *Recommendations* of Books. I shall afterwards prove, that notwithstanding all the noise he makes about *Blondel*, yet, he has either never read him, or he has not understood him. But he seems as little acquainted with his other Master *Salmasius*; for he very Learnedly makes two different Books of *Walo Messalinus*, and *Salmasius* his Book, *De Episcopis & Presbyteris*. Take it in his own Words (v) He (v) §. 13. p. 15. *is full as unhappy*, [says he of me] *in his next Witness*, *Salmasius*, *who both in his Book De Episcopis & Presbyteris is against this Author*, and in *Walo Messalinus*, *that is commonly ascribed to him*.

HE is every whit as Happy in his Censures. Thus, he fairly calls in Question the Genuineness of *Cornelius* his Epistle § XXXVIII [or rather Epistles] to *Fabius* of *Antioch*, mentioned by *Eusebius*. I had Cited *Cornelius* his Authority in that Epistle, for *Exorcists* and *Acolyths*, &c. and referred to *Euseb. Lib. 6. C. 43*. Now hear *G. R.* (w) *I find the Epistle of Cornelius* [says (w) §. 13. p. 17. he] *in Euseb. Lib. 6. C. 42. He [i. e. I] calleth it 43. How Genuine that Epistle of Cornelius is, or the Account that Eusebius giveth of it, I shall not now enquire*. Does not this plainly import that he had something to say against both the *Epistle* and *Eusebius's* Account of it, if he had leisure for it? 'Twas pity he wanted Leisure to bless the World with such a new Discovery: For I do verily believe, he is the first Man that has question'd that Epistle. Neither must I escape for saying it was *Cap. 43*. tho' I am sure I Cited according to the Numbers of *Stephanus* and *Valesius*, who, I suppose, have given us the accuratest Editions of *Eusebius*.

AND now that we have *Eusebius* before us, I hope it shall § XXXIX. not be an unpardonable Digression to take notice how *G. R.* in the last Book he has published, *His good old Way defended*, has attempted to ruin for ever the Credit of *Eusebius's* Ecclesiastical History, and that by two Arguments. One is, that *Socrates* testifieth of *Eusebius's* History, *Lib. I. C. I. That he took more care to praise the Emperour, than to describe the Acts of that Time*, (x) which might perhaps have been deem'd of (x) *Good old Way. p. 134.* some weight, if *Socrates* had not expressly told us, that he meant this (not of *Eusebius's* Ecclesiastical History, but) of his Books of the Life of *Constantine*. The other Argument is,

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

That *Eusebius* Citeth *Sozomen*, Lib. 3. C. 20, (says *G. R.* 23 say I) who lived an hundred Years after him. I know *G. R.* has been very heartily Laugh'd at by many for using such an Argument: An Argument founded indeed on a most notorious and gross Mistake; the Mistake of taking *Σοζόμενος* for the Historian *Sozomen*; whereas *Eusebius* is only there giving the Name of one of *Clemens Alexandrinus's* Books, as is evident, not only from that 23^d Chapter of Lib. 3. but also from Lib. 6. Cap. 13. A Book still extant; the whole Title whereof is, τίς ὁ Σοζόμενος πλάνος i. e. What Rich man can be saved? But I must be so just to *G. R.* as to tell my Countrymen who laugh at him on this occasion, that they ought not to make him the only Butt of their Laughter. For this Blunder is not peculiar to him; neither might he have found it only in *Meredith Hamner's* old English Translation (cited for it by *G. R.* in a Letter to a Friend, who had put him to it to account for his Argument) or in a Latin Translation, wherein, if we may believe the Title Page, no meaner Men than *Musculus*, *Joachimus*, *Camerarius*, *Joannes Christophersonus*, and *Joannes Jacobus Grynæus* were concerned. (y) But likewise other Three of our most Renowned Scottish Presbyterians had it before him. Mr. *Andrew Melvin*, Mr. *David Calderwood*, and Mr. *Thomas Forrester*. Melvin, in an admirable Book, Entitled *Scoti contra typhos paraclesis contra Danielis Tileni Silestii paranesin ad Scotos Genevensis Disciplinæ Zelotas Conscriptam*. Printed Anno 1622, Scourges poor *Eusebius* to purpose, Cap. 30. §. 5. And one of the Lashes he gives him, is this, Citaturne ab *Eusebio Sozomenus* qui post *Eusebium* centum annos vixit? i. e. What, doth not *Eusebius* Cite *Sozomen*, who lived an hundred Years after *Eusebius*? *Calderwood* also in his *Altare Damascenum*, having first rejected *Eusebius's* Authority, as being an Indiligent Historian; as having many Fabulous things in him; many false Stories; many Anathronisms, &c. at last, adds thus, But let *Eusebius* be a Witnes beyond all exception, yet, without doubt, his History has been Interpolated by some very unskilful Imposter, for he mentions *Sozomen*, who was born an hundred Years after him. (z) And as *Melvin* had, for his Author, Robert Parker in his second Book, *De politeia Ecclesiastica*, 273. So Mr. *Forrester* in his *Rectius Instruendum* p. 195, 196. has pretty faithfully Translated *Calderwood*, and concludes the matter thus: Admit *Eusebius's* Testimony were above all exception, yet that his History hath been corrupted by some ignorant Imposter,

(y) Edit Basil.
An. 1587.

(z) Alt. Dam.
p. 119.

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

50

Impostor, is demonstrated from this by Didoclave (i. e. Calderwood) that he makes mention of Sozomen, who was Born an hundred Years thereafter. And the same Forrester in his late Book entitled, The Hierarchical Bishop's Claim, &c. (a) insists (a) Part I. p. 19 over again on the same very Argument. And now that I have named this Book, I cannot forbear to say, that 'tis one of the pleasantest I have seen; especially when the Author humbles himself to consider any thing of Antiquity. May I not digress so far as to give my Reader a small Specimen?

THE *Epistles of Clement. of the first Century, (says For-* §. XL
rester) are very pregnant against the Divine Right of Prelacy; particularly his Epistle to the Philippians— (b) As if ever there (b) Part I. p. 19 had been such an Epistle. There are no parts of Hegesippus now extant. (c) What not so much as one Fragment in all (c) ibid. p. 49 Eusebius? Or are all those Fragments Forgeries foisted in, like Sozomen by some ignorant Impostor? Again, having affirmed that the primitive Bishops were no more than fixed Moderators, And this (says he) was (as Ambrose phrases it) multorum Sacerdotum judicio Constitutum, or by the Judgment and Appointment of the Presbytery. Presbyteri, saith he, (i. e. Ambrose) unum ex se Electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant, so that in Ambrose's sense, He (who was called Bishop) had this Prostatie, or new Name, as their Mouth and Moderator. (d) Now it is certain that the (d) ibid. p. 52. Multorum Sacerdotum judicio Constitutum, is not Ambrose's, but Hilary's in his Commentary on Eph. 4. and here most wretchedly misapplied by Mr. Forrester, as will at first sight appear to any who considers the Context. And the next Latin Sentence, Unum ex se Electum, is neither Ambrose's nor Hilary's, but Jerom's in his Epistle to Evagrius. Again, If he (D. Scot) mean, that we hold that there was a formal general Council Decreeing this, as he with his fellow Pleaders fasten this Gloss upon that Passage of Jerom, Prospiciente Concilio— and Toto orbe Decretum est— (e) And again, Jerom says, Prospi- (e) ibid. p. 55. ciente Concilio & toto orbe Decretum est— (f) Now that (f) ibid. p. 62. Phrase Prospiciente Concilio, tho' thus twice ascribed to Jerom, is yet none of Jerom's but Hilary's in his above-cited Commentary. Again, as for Jerom's Epistle ad Nepot; asserting that what Aaron and his Sons were, that are the Bishops and Presbyters— (g) Jerom says so indeed in his Epistle to Evagrius, (g) p. 39. but no such matter in his Epistle to Nepotianus. Once more, Gratian (says he) shews that Ecclesia habet Senatum Presbyterorum.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

(b) *ibid.* p. 90. *orum.* (b) But they are *Jerom's* words, only cited by *Gratian*. Farther yet, *Cyprian*. Ep. 6. and 28. professes, he neither
(s) *ibid.* p. 90. could, nor would do any thing without the Clergy. (i) But if there is any such thing, either expressed or insinuated in any of all *St. Cyprian's* Epistles, I am satisfied that *Mr. Forrester* be reputed the Learnedest Man on Earth. Nay, *Cyprian* calls Presbyters his Collegues (k) which if he does, so much as once in all his works, I am content that Presbyterian Government prevail at all Times, and in all Places, would you have more?
(l) *ibid.* p. 111. The Tenth Book of *Ruffinus* his History is cited by him. (l) And yet he never wrote more than Two. And we must acknowledge (says he) the late distinction of Clergy and Laity to be
(m) *ibid.* p. 52. far remote from *St. John's* Time. (m) And yet *Clemens Romanus* who died many Years before *St. John* has it more expressly (not indeed in any Epistle to the *Philippians*, but) in his genuine Epistle to the *Corinthians*. * These Instances may

* Vide *Clementis* Epistolam. §. xl. in *Cotelerii* Bibliotheca.

§. XLI.

(n) §. 34. p. 45.

HE gives another good Instance of his critical Skill in *Clemens Romanus* his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*. (n) I had adduced a Testimony from it: And G. R. returns two Answers. The first may be afterwards considered; 'tis the second I am concern'd about at present. Our Author may know [says he] That that and others of the Epistles that go under *Clement's* Name, are rejected as none of his, by Learned Men, and on solid Grounds. Now, to let alone the solid Grounds, I would only gladly know the Names of those Learned Men who rejected that Epistle to the *Corinthians*, since it was first publish'd by our Learned Countrey-man, *Patrick Young*, Anno. 1633. Sure I am, *Blondel* (o) *Salmasius* (p) *Rivoetus* (q) *Smectymnus* (r) The Provincial Assembly of London (s) The Divines at *Newport* (t) *Ludovicus Capellus* (v) *Joannes Dallæus* (u) *Mr. Baxter* (w) *Dr. Owen* (x) *Johannes Hoornbeek* (y) The Author of the Case of Accommodation &c (z) The Author of the *Apologia pro Ministris vulgo dictis Non conformistis*. (a) The Author of the *Apologia pro Epistola ad Renatum verideum*. (b) Nay even *Mr. Jamison* (c) and *Mr. Forrester* (d) And I cannot tell how many more of G. R.'s Friends, do all allow it to be Genuine. Most of them give it its due Praises. Nor is there any

any Monument of Antiquity, on which they lay more of the Strefs of their Cause [tho' without Reason] than this Epistle : So that the Reader may judge whether it was with or without good Acquaintance of this Epistle that G. R. talked so about it. But,

Vindication p. 79. (i) Append. ad Jus Divin. Minist. Evangel. p. 104. (r) in their first Paper. (u) Thes. Salmur. Part 3. Disp. 22. §. 40. (v) De Confirmatione. &c. Lib. 2. Cap. 2. p. 115. Et de Scriptis quæ sub Dionysii. &c. Et Ignatii Nominibus Ci cumferuntur Lib. 1. Cap. 3. p. 168. Lib. 2. Cap. 26. p. 398. (w) First Disputation of Church Government, p. 67, &c. (x) Review of the true Nature of Schism, Oxford, 1637. p. 72. 74. (y) Epist. de Independentismo p. 68. 112. (z) p. 26. (a) p. 33. (b) p. 74. (c) Nazianzeni Querela, Part 2. p. 114. 191. (d) Hierarchical Bishops Claim, &c. Part 1. p. 19, &c. Licet satis Ridiculè.

OF all the Attempts he has made, that on St. Cyprian is the pleasantest. He had a little entangled himself in so resolutely Appealing to the Cyprianic Principles; and an escape was to be made; and all other ways being block'd up, he was even forc'd to venture through St. Cyprian's Sides. He does not indeed in plain and direct Terms call in Question the Authority of St. Cyprian's Writings: It had been a little too shameless first to have Appeal'd to St. Cyprian, and then to come off with saying that St. Cyprian's Works are not Genuine: But he has done it really more ways than one. He tells us that St. Cyprian's Authority is insufficient to prove a Divine Truth. (e) Be it so: But did not you Appeal to him? And will common Sense admit of such a Defence, an Appeal once being made? Again, I insist not [says he] on the supposition that St. Cyprian's Epistles are corrupted, &c. (f) When corrupted Sir? I hope not since you made your Appeal: And if before, why did you make it? Nay, there is a Third way he has fallen on to make his Escape by; which is by telling, in effect, That St. Cyprian's Meaning is not to be taken from St. Cyprian's Words, this he has twenty times over. What can be either more Ingenious or more Ingenuous than such Attempts? Such is G. R.'s Skill in censuring of Books. I come now to,

VI. HIS Recommendations. Two Books he has most strenuously Recommended. (g) I desire the Reader, who can, [says he] for farther satisfaction [in the Controversy between the Prelatists and Presbyterians.] would read Paul Baynes Dilectans Trial, And Mr. Peregrine's Letters Patents for Presbytery, they have somewhat that is singular on this Subject. I confess

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

feels I had no small Curiosity to see Two Books which were so effectually Recommended by G. R. But I cannot tell with what difficulty it was that I got a sight of them. 'Tis a Fault they are not Reprinted: I think G. R.'s Zeal should have obliged him to represent a matter of such Consequence to the general Assembly. But have they somewhat Singular indeed? Yes, they have as much as makes it Singularly pleasant, that they should have been so zealously Recommended. For,

§ XLIV.

PAUL BAYNES is indeed all over Independent: He is not only still Reckoned and Cited for one by Hoornbeek in his long Epistle *De Independentismo*. (b) By D. Ames in his Preface to Mr. Baynes Book, as Hoornbeek understands him. (i) and by Beverly as cited by the same Hoornbeek. (k) But it is most evident from his Book, the same very Book which G. R. has Recommended so earnestly. For Mr. Baynes States his first Question in these very Terms, *Whether Christ did Institute, or his Apostles Frame any Diocesan Form of Churches, or Parishonal only?* And having first mustered the Arguments insisted on by the Advocates for Diocesan Churches, he makes his Transition to his Arguments for his own Side, in these Words. *Now we must muster those Forces which oppose these Diocesan Churches, allowing only such Churches to be Instituted of Christ, which may MEET in ONE CONGREGATION, ordinarily.* (l) And again, *That wherein we contradict one another, is, we affirm that no such Head Church was Ordained either Virtually or Actually, but that all Churches were SINGULAR CONGREGATIONS, EQUAL, INDEPENDENT each of other in regard of Subjection.* (m) Indeed all his Arguments p. 4, 5, 6. do equally impugn Classical, Provincial, and National, as well as Episcopal Diocesan Churches. Nay, it is the main Design of his whole Book to establish Churches only Congregational. (n) what can be more plain Independent Reasoning than that which he has p. 9? The sum is this; 'God has not set any local Bounds to Churches in the New Testament; Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction doth Respicere subitos only per se, not Terminos locales, &c. which is notoriously a Fundamental Principle of Independency; the Principle on which they proceeded in their Collections of Churches out of other Churches. And again (o) he affirms, *That Ministers are Independent on one another in the use and exercise of their calling; and that the People or the Church collective, the Christians of a single Independent Congregation can set over themselves a Pastor or Bishop, and they can de-*

- (b) p. 8. 45.
- 67. 70. 83. 116.
- (i) p. 8.
- (k) p. 83.

(l) p. 4.

(m) p. 13.

(n) See p. 35.

47. 71. 75. 77.

pose him. This he pleads for with all his might. (p) In (p) p. 88. 89. short, he is more expressly Independent than Mr. Clarkson himself. His Book has the same Design with Clarkson's, viz. to maintain That all Primitive Churches were only Congregational. He has paved the way to Clarkson for avoiding the dint of an Argument as much insisted on by all true Presbyterians, by Rutherford himself, by the Westminster Assembly itself, against the Congregational Men, as by any Prelatist upon any occasion; namely, the Argument, That all the Christians in Jerusalem made but one Church, and yet there were more Christians in that than could meet together in one Ordinary Assembly for Worship, &c. He has paved the way, I say, to Clarkson, by answering That it was by accident of a Circumstance, happily of the Passover, that so many Christians were at Jerusalem when Paul came to it, Acts 21. (q) 'Tis true indeed, (q) p. 4. 5. Clarkson has a little Corrected the Evasion; he saw it was Ridiculous to make them so numerous, at that time, upon the account of the Passover; therefore he betakes himself to Pentecost, which yet, when duly sifted, can stand him in as little stead: But that is not my present Business. It is enough, if Baynes and Clarkson agree in Design; and indeed Baynes his Zeal has prompted him to bolder strokes than Clarkson had Courage for; for Instance, rather than grant there were more than one Congregation in Rome, in Cornelius's time, he adventures to maintain that 20000 People might make but One Congregation, (r) which cannot but seem (r) p. 20. Ridiculous to any who considers the Circumstances of the Church in those times. And now, let the Reader judge with what Reason G. R. could so heartily recommend Paul Baynes Book, and withal say as he has said, (s) viz. That he does (s) §. 19. p. not join with Clarkson in the whole Design of his Book. Let him judge, with what Reason G. R. a zealous Presbyterian could recommend to his Readers, a Book which was so much design'd for Establishing Independency, and overthrowing the Scheme of Presbytery, as much as Diocesan Episcopacy.

BUT has he nothing Singular against Diocesan Episcopacy? §. XLV. Nothing, so far as I have observed. I have indeed observed him (I shall not say Singularly, but I will say) very signally weak in his Reasonings on divers Occasions. I shall only entertain the Reader with one or two for a Taste. He Reasons against a Diocesan Church, any Church that is extend-
ed be-

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled

(t) p. 8. 9.

ed beyond a single Congregation, in these very Words, (t) Those Churches which Christ did ordain, and the Apostles plant might ordinarily Assemble to the Ordinances for Worship: But a Diocesan Church cannot ordinarily Assemble. E. — if any Man distinguish the Assumption, and consider a Diocesan as she is in her parts, or as she is a Totum standing of her Parts now Collected together; and say, she may, and doth meet and Communicate, and Edifice her self in the first Respect; I answer, This is nothing, and doth prove her to be nothing, as she is a Diocesan Church; Quia, quicquid est agit Secundum quod est: If therefore a Diocesan Church were a real Church, she must have the Effect of such a Church, to wit, Assembling, as she is Diocesan. The Synagogues thro' Israel met Sabbath by Sabbath, but were no National Church in this regard, that is to say, as it was a National Church, it had her National real Meetings. Now, besides that all this Reasoning is purely on the Independent Principles, is it not plain, that, if it proves any thing at all, it proves the Impossibility of one Catholick Church, and by Consequence Robs us of one of the Articles of our Creed? Again, he Reasons against James's being Bishop of Jerusalem, to this purpose (u) That James, as an Apostle was Infallible; but had he been a Bishop, as such, he had been Fallible, and so the People had been miserably Intricated, because they should not have been able to discern, whether what he taught, he taught as an infallible Apostle or as a Fallible Bishop; and therefore he could not be Bishop of Jerusalem. Now I think one might almost venture to say, that this is truly Singular Reasoning, once more, what do you think of his Fifth Conclusion, and the Reason of it, p. 77? I shall give it Word for Word. No order of Ministers or Servants can have Majority of Directive and Corrective Power over those who are in an Inferiour Order of Ministry and Service. The Reason is, because this exceedeth the bounds of Ministerial Power, and is a participation of that despotical Power which is appropriate to the Master of the Family. Now, let G. R. either make good Reason of this, or Reconcile it with the Presbyterian Principles, if he can. Indeed

C. XLVI.

(v) p. 39.

(w) p. 44.

THIS Recommended Author more than once or twice, directly contradicts G. R. e. g. he makes Evangelists (not subordinate to, but) Collateral with the Apostles, (v) which I am sure, G. R. has many times contradicted in his Writings. Again, Baynes affirms, (w) That Jerome's TOTO ORBE DECRETUM EST, &c. Imports no more than that

it

it was took up in time, for Custom, through the World. But G. R. in his good old way Defended (x) has quite another Notion of (x) §. 6. §. 7. it. He calls it most absurd to say that that Decretum was *Con-* P. 75. *fiuetudo Ecclesiæ*: A Decree and a Custom (says he) are two different things; nor was it ever heard of till this new Master of Words (A. M. D. D.) arose that a Decree was so called: Custom may follow on a Decree; and the same thing may be Decreed, which hath accidentally obtain'd by Custom; but to say, a thing (e. g. the setting up of Bishops as the Remedy of Schism) had its Original from Custom, and to mean it had its rise from a Decree is to speak Nonsense. Once more Mr. Baynes makes the High-Priest among the Jews, most plainly, to have acted in Parity with the other Priests. He affirms that The other Priests were of the same Order with the High Priests, and that all the difference lay in Degree of Dignity. And he says expressly that The high Priest had no Majority of Power either Directive or Corrective over others. (y) Now how is this consistent with G. R's Assertion, (y) p. 50. in his Cyprianic Bishop Examined, (z) viz. That The High (z) §. 34. P. 43. Priest had universal supreme Authority over the universal Church that then was? It had been easie to have produced more of Paul Baynes's bad Reasonings, more Arguments of his being Independent, more of his Triflings, more of his Clashings even with G. R. &c. But the Sample I have given, methink, may give my Reader occasion enough to judge, whether G. R. is not singular for skill at Recommending of Books.

AND yet Paul Baynes his *Diocesan Trial* is but a puny Instance when compared with Mr. PEREGRIN's *Letters Patents*, &c. For, indeed, if ever Book was, it is a Singular one; at least, to my Sence, never Book I have had the luck to see; no not *Rectius Instruendum*, nor *Animadversions on Dr. Stillingfleet's Irenicum*, nor *The Rational Defence of Non Conformity*, nor *The good old way Defended*, &c. has more singular Singularities in it. Take this Specimen. And

I. WITH a singular Boldness, he Dedicates his Book to §. XLVIII. God Almighty, and that too, as if it had been written by Divine Inspiration. Take it in his own Words, *To whom then but to Thee, O dreadful God, should I thy poor Servant Dedicate these HIS* (I think Grammer would have required it should have been *MY*) *weak Labours? For thou, O Lord God, best knowest the work that thou hast wrought in Thine, &c. Sure I am, here is either singular Boldness or singular Familiarity.*

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled

§. XLIX.

2. NEVER Man more *singular* for skill in Antiquity ; for tho' he adorns his Title Page with this glorious Inscription, *The Letters Patents of Presbytery ; with the Plea and Fruits of the Prelacy, Manifested out of the Scriptures, Fathers, Ecclesiastical History, Papists, and sundry other Authors.* By James Peregrin. Yet not one Sentence in all the Book worthy of such an *Hia-tus*, particularly, as for the Fathers, it does not appear from his Book that he had ever Read a Line of them. His Citations from them are *few and trite* : And his Margent Confesses, he had them mostly from *Bellarmin* and *Du Plessis*.

§. I.

3. HE is most *singular* in most of his Reasonings. e. g. having cited St. Paul's Words to the Pastors at Ephesus, Act. 20. 28. He subjoins thus (a) *whence it is infallibly plain that Presbyterian Government is the exprest Ordinance of the Holy Ghost who changeth not, and of whom Christ saith, he shall not speak of himself, for he shall take of Mine, and shew unto you. Now Christ is yesterday and to Day, and the same also for ever. This Ordinance is therefore unalterable. I will not contend with G. R. about this Reasoning. I do readily acknowledge, it is very singular ; yet not more than what he has Page 10. where having cited 1 Tim. 4. 14. for the Power of Presbyters in Ordinations, he subjoins, Kemnitius therefore doth well observe here, That a Bishop may be ordain'd by Presbyters ; therefore (says Peregrin) There is no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter. A Sovereign may be Inaugurated by his Subjects, therefore there is no difference between a Sovereign and a Subject. Again,*

§. LI.

4. BELLARMIN, as cited by Peregrin p. 12. had inferred from 1 Tim. 5. 19. That Timothy was a Bishop, the judge of Presbyters, Therefore, their Prince and Superiour This cannot be true (says Peregrin) Why ? Because Christ saith to his Disciples, *ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion over them &c.* And St. Peter saith to the Presbyters, *take the oversight of the Flock, &c.* Now, is not this *singular* Reasoning even as you have it already ? What then will you think of the *singularity* of it, when you consider that, with the same Breath, he acknowledges that not Apostles only but *Evangelists* were greater than Presbyters. This I say he acknowledges not only Page 13. & 15. but in that same very 12th Page in which he Reasons so against Bellarmin. And p. 16. we have the very cream of *Singularity*. For there he tells us that *All who are against Presbyterian ruling Elders, resist the Ordinance of God,*

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

59
57

God, Rom. 13. Now if we may believe the Apostle, there, *They that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation.* Give Ear, O ye Prelatists, O ye French Protestants, O thou Catholick Church for full 15 Centuries, consider the Danger, the unavoidable Danger of denying the Divine Institution of the Holy Order of ruling Elders as Contradistinct from Preaching Presbyters. For my part I never adverted to it before: Damnation! 'Tis a pretty hard Sentence.

5. WOULD the Reader have any more of Mr. Peregrin's §. LII. Singularities? Let him go on in that that same 16th Page and he will find that the *The ten great Persecutions were ended and over when one of the Elders Rev. 17. spake to St. John.* And, he will find him (p. 16. and 17) making a good Argument for Presbyterian Government, of the very single mention of an Elder in that same Chapter. But if you consider Rev. 19. 4, 5, 6. you have perfect Demonstration for it; so perfect that the Conclusion is, *It is there predicted that Prelacy must fall, and that all, as well high as low, should endeavour to know so much; That knowing it, when in Prayer they say, Thy Kingdom come (However it seems Peregrin was not against the Lord's Prayer) in Heart, they may both pray that God would send it (viz. the overthrow of Prelacy) and use the best means they can to effect it.* And p. 40. he affirms that the Council of Nice established the power and Primacy of the Pope.

6. HAS the Reader any more Stomack for Mr. Peregrin's Singularities? then, let him turn to page 34. and he shall §. LIII. find a Treasure of as Singular Something as ever he read in his Life. Take it in the worthy Author's own Words. Having form'd an Objection against himself, viz. That Diocesan Bishops appear'd very soon after the Death of the Apostle, &c. He answers to it, thus. *Bishops were then Diocesan and provincial rather Nemine quam Re, in Name than in Deed, exercising little Power and Authority over them (the Presbyters) He (the Bishop) was not then come to his Power and strength; was then little other than a Presbyter in Matter of Government: — He Govern'd like them and with them. The Presbyters had their Voices in Councils; they neither were nor would be soon thrust out.* How sorts this account with G. R's. already accounted for? (m) This by the way; come we now to the very Kernel of Mr. P's Singularity. So, for that time, they had still (m) §. 6. the Essential parts of a true Church; at least, till such stains and blemishes grew greater; and the Hierarchy exercised more Authority

over the Presbyters; and became the Mint, Defence and Authority of Human Invention, and Error, Superstition, and to be made a mark of the true Church. Then the Mystery of Iniquity that had long wrought in that Invention began to shew the fruits thereof. This I think may pass for an Original Singularity. But to go on, Mr. Peregrine will needs have Prelacy to have introduced Popery; in which, I do confess, he is not singular. But then he does it by an Argument which very well deserves to be so dubbed. Grant (says he p. 34.) that they may ordain Diocesan Bishops, and that their Ordinance is by a DIVINE INSTINCT, and of good Authority; and it will follow that others, afterwards, may as well ordain the rest (viz. Archbishops, Patriarchs, the Pope) and that their Ordinance also is by DIVINE INSTINCT, and of good Authority. And so indeed, to ordain Cardinals, and as many upstart Orders of Priests and Friars as are among the Papists. I might add setting up of Images to be worshiped, and all other Popish Tenets and Customs which have been Authorized by Councils and Kings, if that were sufficient as some think it is. But now 'tis time to have done with Pleasant Mr. Peregrine, and the afore only one Singularity more, and good Morrow to him till another Occasion. You have it p. 12. where he cites Ovid, saying, *There be Clerks which possess more under poor Christ than erst they did under the Rich Devil.*

§. LIV.

BY this time, the Reader, I think, may competently Judge of G. R.'s skill in Recommending of Authors. I have been so careful about all I have said or cited from both his Singular Men, that I dare appeal to G. R. himself concerning my Fidelity. I have no where found him commending or recommending Beza, Gerson Bucer, Blondel, Salmasius, Daille, or any other truly learned Author with half the Zeal. What can be the Reason? I must let it alone, for I am not able to satisfy my self about it. However, I think, I may now fairly come to the Conclusion I aim'd at, namely, that whatever G. R.'s skill may be in giving Accounts or Censuring, or Recommending of Books; it is not such as can lay any considerable Obligation on one to Answer his Cyprianic Bishop Examind. And sure I am, his skill in managing some Controversies, to which, yet, he has applied himself very warmly, can as little make it necessary; as I shall shew in one Instance, viz. The Controversie about ruling Elders, before I have done. (n) now, I think 'tis reasonable to give my Reader an account of the

(n) See Chap.
8.

Motives

Motives which prevailed with me to be at so much Pains, where there was so little real necessity. And here I am afraid, I shall not give him so full satisfaction as he may expect, but such as I can, I shall give very frankly.

§. LV.

THE Reason which was offered to me by my Friends to oblige me to reply to G. R. I must confess did at first sight seem to me to have a more natural and plain a *Tendency* towards *Dissuading* me to undergo such a Drudgery. It was that tho' my Book did not need a *Vindication*, yet it was not fit that G. R.'s. should want an *Answer*. A Reason which, as I have said, seems rather to conclude for *Ease* than *Toil*; For *Silence* rather than any more laborious *Scribbling*. For why should one be oblig'd to write *Vindications*, as often as another shall have the *Heart* to write to little or no purpose against him? and it adds not a little to the force of this Reasoning, that such an one as G. R. is that *other*. G. R. I say, who in most of his Writings (for Instances, the last two I have seen: His *Appendix* to his *Cyprianic Bishop Examined*; and his *Good old Way defended*) has given the World good Ground to believe that he has, indeed. One fixed Principle, which is, to Vindicate whatever he has once written, whether advisedly or rashly; whether with or without Reason; G. R. who, for any thing I know, for any thing that appears, will write any thing rather than give over writing; G. R. with whom the having the *last Word*, seems in most Cases to be the *first Reason* of writing; yet after some more Thinking, and some other Importunities I found my self inclin'd to alter, if not my Opinion, at least my Resolution; and once more to try if he is capable of Conviction. For

§. LVI.

BESIDES that G. R. as I have said, is one if not the only *Stated*, *Authoriz'd Advocate* for his Party; so that, to despise him, or neglect him, doth not precisely terminate on himself; besides this I say, it seems of a long time to have been one of the *resolv'd Maxims* (shall I call it? or *fix'd Humours*) of the Party, that, whatever else they may bear with, yet they must not bear with an Adversaries having the *last Word*, and *another*, That whatsoever Book is written by any of them, whether well or ill it matters not) if it be not *Answered*, must therefore be *Engrossed* into a certain Canon they seem to have of *Books* which they call *unanswerable*; and so must become a *Book of unquestionable*

Autho-

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled

Authority with their Credulous Disciples: So far, that tho' you propose to them never so clear *Demonstrations* of their *Errours*, yet you must not prevail, so long as they have to say, That such a Man has written such an *unanswerable Book*, while, in the mean time, all the Reason they have for saying so is, that perhaps no body has been at the pains to give it a direct, particular and formal *Answer*, and perhaps even that too, for this very good Reason, That it deserved *none*.

§. LVII.

WHOSO has observ'd how familiar it is with them to have in their Mouths, *Altare Damascenum, Vindiciæ Epistolæ Philadelphi, The Canterburians self Conviction, The Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, Durham on the Revelation, Rectius Instruendum*, and I do not know how many such Books, cannot think that I am injurious to them in this Matter. But I shall make sure work of it, by giving my Reader a Taste of those *Heights of Assurance* wherewith they use to refer to such Books, in their published Writings. Thus.

§. LVIII.

THE Prelacer to that History, which commonly goes under the name of Mr. Calderwood's, says, *He needs say no more in the Commendation of it than it was written by famous Mr. David Calderwood, whose Praise is in the Churches of Christ, as elsewhere, so particularly upon the account of his being (but under another and borrowed Name of Edvardus Didoclavius) the Author of that very Learned and Elaborate Treatise, Entituled, Altare Damascenum, wherein he doth by Scripture, Reason and Fathers, irrefragably and UNANSWERABLY (and indeed for any thing we know, says he, it hath not been ANSWERED, to this Day, nor belike will afterwards) demonstrate the Iniquity of designing and endeavouring to Model and Conform the Divinely simple Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland to the Pattern of the pompously Prelatick and Ceremonious Church of England.*

§. LIX.

THE Author of the *Defence of the unlawfulness and danger of limited Episcopacy*, published Anno. 1641 assures his Reader (b) that *There are a number of Passages of the Fathers for ruling Elders in the Book of Gersom Buce us, which the boldest of the Prelatic Party, for all their big Words and Exclamations, in the Ears of silly People, after 22 Years Advertisement DURST never so much as OFFER to ANSWER. And what Plebeian Presbyterian, after this, was not bound to believe Bucer's Book to be UNANSWERABLE at least, as to the Point of Ruling Elders?*

THE

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

61

THE Reviewer of Dr. Bramhall's Fair warning to take heed of §. LX. the Scottish Discipline, affords us good store of such Books; thus *Lysimachus Nicanor* and *Issachars Burden* had an Answer from Mr. Baylie, which some Years before (the writing of this Review) was printed at London, Edingburgh and Amsterdam (Three notable Impressions, you see, in three notable Cities) and all this without a Rejoinder from any of the Prelatic Faction to that Day. (c) Again, D. Laud stands Convicted of Arminianism, Popery and Tyranny (no doubt in the *Canterburians* self Conviction) without an ANSWER. (d) yes, without an ANSWER! For tho' that great Man did more solidly subvert the very Foundations of Popery in his excellent Account of his Conference with Fisher than ever any Scottish Presbyterian has done; tho' he did most Conscientiously purge himself of all Inclinations to either Popery or Tyranny in his very last Speech, at his Martyrdom, some years before this Review was written, yet there was no stated and formal Answer given to *The Canterburians self Conviction*, and therefore it was UNANSWERABLE.

(c) Edit. Hague 1661. Cap. 1. p. 2.
(d) Cap. 7. p. 47.

HEAR him again. None of the Prelatic party has had the §. LXI. Courage to offer one word of Answer to the Scriptures and Fathers which in great plenty Mr. Parker and Mr. Didoclave of old, and of late, *That Miracle of Learning* most noble Somais, and that *Magazin of Antiquity* Mr. Blondel have Printed against them. (e) 'Tis true, the Book from which I cited these Passages (e) C. 8. p. 54. was written An. 1649. and D. Hammond, had not then published his *Dissertations*, in which he called *Blondel*, and sometimes *Salmasius* to an account; but then those *Dissertations* did not meddle with *Parker* and *Didoclave*, so that they do still continue of the Number of UNANSWERABLE Books. Once more (f) *The warner* (i. e. D. Bramhall) would do well §. C. 12 p. 74. to consider and Answer, after seven Years advice, Mr. Baylie his parallel of the Service (of the Church of England) with the *Mis-sal and Breviary*, before he present the *VWorld* with new parallels of the English Liturgy with the *Directories* of the Reformed Churches. Is it not fairly imported in these Words [*would do well to consider and Answer*] that to answer Baylie's Parallel was more than the Doctor was able to do? Or, which is the same thing, that that parallel was unanswerable?

I AM unwilling to give my Reader a surfeit of such §. LXII. Stuff. I shall therefore mention only one Book more before I come to G. R. It is that which bears the Name of
Rectius

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled

Rectius Instruendum; a Book not only frequently praised by that Man of Marvelous Principles, the Author of *The Hind let loose*, but also, lately, placed by Mr. Jamison, now one of the *First-rate* writers of the Party, in his *Canon of Unanswerable Books*, in the very first Paragraph of his *Nazianzenian Querela*. Take his own Words. *The purpose of our present Discourse* (says he) *is not, directly, That much tossed debate, if an Office in the Church for Species or Kind Superiour to that of Dispensing the Word and Sacraments, hath any footing or warrant in the Word of God? Neither will this be judged necessary by any who call to Mind, That many Treatises, disproving the Divine Right of Episcopacy, as Altare Damascenun, and Rectius Instruendum, have had so good success, that for ought I know, they stand intirely without any shadow of an Answer.* So says Mr. Jamison; and yet I dare be bold to tell my Reader, that he shall not find many Indications of either great Learning or good Sense in this *Rectius Instruendum*. It is even much of a piece with its Parents other Book mentioned before. (g) But I may have occasion afterwards to give a *Specimen* of it. All I have to say at present, is, That I am not able to Fancy to my self any shadow of a Reason, for which it should be deem'd *unanswerable*, unless it be that the Author against whom it was written, lived some 11 or 12 Years after its Publication, and never did it (that which indeed it deserved not) the *worship* of an *Answer*. And so.

(g) §. XL.

§. LXIII.

I COME to G R. whose Books if you Read, you shall not only find him frequently referring you to Mr. Gillispies *Affertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland*, as an *unanswerable* Book for Ruling Elders; and the *unlawfulness and danger of limited Episcopacy*, as an *unanswerable* Book against constant Moderators, and I know not how many other such Books: But you shall even find him not unfrequently referring you to his own *unanswered* Books. I have seen two of them; both written against the truly Learned Dr. Stillingfleet; one against his *Irenicum*, the other against his *unreasonableness of the Separation from the Church of England*; which Books of G R's, I am told, those of his Party do very much admire and recommend. But, so far as I know, or can conjecture, for no other Reason than that Dr. Stillingfleet did never humble himself to reply to them; and I do verily believe, tho' he had lived Nestor's days, he never would.

I am confident there had been no Cause for it. One step nearer home.

WHEN the excellent A. M. D. D. in his *Enquiry into the* §. LXIV. *new Opinions, &c.* (g) told G. R. that it was needless to cite (g) p. 63. particular Testimonies from St. Cyprian for the superiority of Bishops, G. R. tells him again in his *Good old Way defended* (b) *that he had seen* I. S's. *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*; and he refers him for Satisfaction about Cyprian's Opinion in point of Church Government to the Answer to that Book, under the Title of, *The Cyprianic Bishop examin'd*, Here (say those who are earnest to have me write) the Matter is fairly brought to my Door; here, (as they construct it) I have a fair Provocation to re enter the Lists with him, and try whether his Book does indeed give such satisfaction. If I do not write, People may, (those of G. R's party will) be ready to conclude that it verily gives Satisfaction about St. Cyprian's Opinion, as he calls it; and so the Credit of *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age* shall utterly be blasted, and G. R's. *Cyprianic Bishop examined* shall stand fair for being shortly received into the Canon, the often mention'd Canon of *Unanswered Books*. But.

BESIDES this I have another and a weightier Reason; §. LXV. G. R. has given me occasion to discourse some things which I hope may be useful to my Country-men. He has in a manner obliged me to give, in full form, the just and true state of the grand Controversie between us and our Brethren, which G. R. (as much and as frequently as he has written about it) seems never to have understood to this very Day; and which, once fairly fix'd, as I hope to fix it, may be useful, if not to end the Controversie, yet, at least, to bring it nearer to a Point, by shewing the true Mark at which all pertinent Arguments on either side must hereafter be levelled. He has likewise in some sort obliged me to shew how plainly and fully St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries have Deposed for the Divine Right of Episcopacy; or, in other Words, how generally the divine Institution of it was Believed in St. Cyprian's time, which I look upon as a Point of no small Moment. Other things of considerable usefulness (at least, so I design them) the Reader may observe as he goes on. In short, my Design is to try, if possibly I can put it beyond all hazard of ever being controverted for the future, That there was True, Real and proper Prelacy in St. Cyprian's Age; which foundation
L being

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled

being once made sure, I may afterwards have the easier work (if God shall allow and assist me) to run it up to the *true source*, The Apostolical Constitution of Church Government, in those Churches whose Constitution they lived to *finish*.

§. LXVI.

FOR these Reasons I have resolved for once to keep G. R's. Book, for some more time, in a state of *Probation*, and to endeavour to convince, at least, some Readers, that tho' never Book of G. R's. should hereafter be *answered* yet it will not necessarily follow that he writes none but *unanswerable* Books.

§. LXVII.

I SAY some Readers, I cannot undertake for all; particularly, I do not expect to convince G. R. himself; he has indeed discouraged all such Expectations. He has told *A. M.*

(i) *God old way.* D. D. (i) *That what I had brought from St. Cyprian to prove that That Martyr asserted Episcopal Jurisdiction, &c. He has endeavoured to Answer. And — if the Doctor would either reinforce the same Citations, or bring new ones, he should not decline the Debate with him.* Now, if G. R. had the Courage to give such a plain and open *Defiance* to one who had so notoriously given him the *Foil*; is it to be thought that so long as there is *Life* in him, he will yield the Controversie to such a one as I am? *Ante lupos rapiunt Hoedi, vulpes ante Leones. Et conversa retro rerum Discordia Gliscet; Multa prius fuerint* — But that shall never hereafter *Rob* me of one Minutes *Rest*; For, if G. R. will needs be so zealous for the *last Word*, he shall have it; and Reason too: For, if what is digested in the following Sheets shall not make him *yield*, all I have more to say is, (not that he must be *Obstinate*, but) that I am not able to *Convince* him.

§. LXVIII.

BEFORE I conclude this Chapter, let me Advertise the Reader, that I am not to pursue G. R. Foot for Foot, as he uses to do his Adversaries. Such a method can neither seem necessary nor useful to any Man who has considered the *Specimen* I have here given of his Talents. And indeed it was for this end (*viz.* that I might be allowed to take another Method) that I gave such a *Specimen*. Neither will I digress to all the *Incidental* Controversies which he has either given me *Occasion* or *Provocation* to engage with him in. The Establishment of a true and proper *Episcopacy* in the Cyprianic Age, is all I aim at; or am willing at present to contend much for; and therefore it shall be all that I shall mainly Endeavour. My *Scheme* is this.

FOR

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

65

FOR proving that the Government of the Church was *Episcopal*, in the Days of St. Cyprian, one Argument I mention'd was, That so much was acknowledged by some of the greatest Champions for Presbytery. This Argument I shall now endeavour to make good; because, before I did only name it. The rest of my Arguments were taken from the Principles of that Age, as we have them Recorded in the Monuments of it. These I shall only maintain by shewing the *Insufficiency* of the main Answers G. R. has been pleased to return to them. This done, I shall endeavour to *Purge* my self and my Friends of a most Groundless Scandal charged upon us by G. R. and his Party, The Scandal of Popery. And last of all, because it was not done in my former Book, and G. R. has given me a warm Provocation to it, I shall endeavour to shew that it was the *universal belief* of the Christians of the Cyprianic Age that *Episcopacy* was of *divine Institution*.

§. LXIX.

I MAY, perhaps, insist more largely on these things than §. LXX. some Readers would require; but I hope such as are *Judicious* will encline to pardon such a Fault, when they consider that my Design is, as much as I can to *End* Controversies; and that Controversies of this Nature cannot be ended without *full Deductions*. Besides, as I have said, above, (i) (i) CHAP. I to fix the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, well, is to shorten §. LIX. the main Controversie with our Brethren; so that *Length* here paves the way to *Brevity* hereafter: And nothing so necessary as a Foundation well laid, for a solid Superstructure. Only one thing I am farther to demand, and I have done. It is that G. R. (or who else soever of his Party shall incline to give me a reply) may be pleased either to let my Book alone, or make it their work not to nibble at *Incidental Escapes*, (whereof perhaps I may be Guilty) but to Grapple with the main Design of it. I mean let it be their work to shew that I have not sufficiently proved that there was proper *Episcopacy* in St. Cyprian's time. Nothing less can serve the Presbyterian Cause. It can do it no substantial service to prove that I (for what am I) have sometimes mistaken the meaning of a Citation, or have fail'd in point of Reasoning, so long as this Proposition stands firm, That in St. Cyprian's time, there was a proper Prelation of a Bishop over Presbyters.

CHAP. I
§. LIX.

C H A P. III.

Episcopacy acknowledged by many Learned Presbyterians to have been in the Church in St. Cyprian's time.

§. I.

THE first Argument I adduced to prove that there was real *Prelacy* in St. Cyprian's time, was that generally the great Champions for *Presbytery* such as *Chamier*, *Blondel*, *Salmasius*, *The Provincial Assembly of London*, &c. do ingenuously acknowledge that long before St. Cyprian's time such *Prelacy* was in the Church. This I called a *shrew'd Presumption* against G. R. and he seems to have been sensible of the Force of it; for tho' I did but transiently mention it, only naming the aforesaid Authors, without producing their Testimonies, yet G. R. turns all *Tempest*; nor have I observed *Fairer Passions* awakened in him than on this Occasion. He tells me, *he knows not what my, &c. may contain in its vast Belly, but*

- (a) §. 11. p. 12. *he is not affraid of them I mention'd* (a) He refers to the Reader to judge with what *BROVV* I could bring *Chamier* for my *Voucher*, who so flatly contradicteth the whole of my Book (b) §. 11. p. 13. *That either I had not read Blondel, but cited him at Adventure, or I have a Confidence to assert what I will, tho' absur'd and unaccountable.* (c) §. 12. p. 15. *countable.* (c) That I am fully as unhappy in *Salmasius* (d) §. 13. p. 15. *And, as for the Provincial Assembly of London, he knows not what Book I meant, neither do I my self, for what appeareth.* (e) §. 13. p. 16. (e) And after he has talked what he thought fit concerning each of those Authors, he tells his Reader *That he shall not hope to say any thing that is Convincing, if what he has brought do not persuade the Unbiass'd Reader that those famous Presbyterians have the same Sentiments of the Judgement of the first Antiquity about the Power of Presbyters that he expressed in the place, I made such a potber about* (f) that is, (if it be to the purpose) That the aforesaid Authors did not acknowledge that there was real *Prelacy* in St. Cyprian's time. Now, if I shall Demonstrate to the Conviction even of the most obstinate, That I had Reason to Cite those Authors, as having made such Acknowledgments, and if I shall make it appear that it was not without Ground that I added the &c. I think I may leave

it to the Reader to judge whether G. R. had ground for so much vapouring.

CHAMIER was the first I named, and that which gave §. II. me BROW to do it was, That *Bellarmin* having adduced the Testimonies of *Ignatius*, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, (all three much elder than St. Cyprian) for the divine Right of Episcopacy; CHAMIER Answers, That *their Testimonies do not conclude any such Divine Right*; they do not shew that there was no Period of time in which Parity obtain'd; they only prove that *INEQUALITY* or *Imparity* is most Ancient, and next Neighbour to the times of the Apostles, which he readily Grants. For *Jerom*, says he, tells that *IMPARITY* prevailed at Alexandria, in the Days of *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*, thereby teaching that it was most Ancient; for those lived about the Year 140 and downward. And the Church of Alexandria was the last which admitted of that Innovation, which therefore we may Conjecture to have begun before the end of the first Century. If my Translation does not please G. R. he has Chamier's Words faithfully Transcribed on the Margent. (g) And does not Chamier here fairly allow Episcopacy to have obtain'd about 150 Years before St. Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage.

(g) Respondeo horum auctoritates nihil efficere. Ratio;

quia non ostendunt nulli unquam tempus extitisse cum essent Episcopi pares Presbyteris; sed tantum *INEQUALITATEM* esse vetustissimam ac vicinam Apostolorum temporibus, quod nos ultro fatemur. Nam *Hieronimus* cum docet eam inequalitatem invaluisse apud *Alexandrinis*, temporibus *Heraclæ* & *Dionysii*, satis diserte docet antiquissimam eam fuisse; nam ii vixerunt Circa Annum 140 & quod excurret; & tamen sic designatur Ecclesia quæ omnium Postrema eam *INNOVATIONEM* admiserit, quam propterea conjicere licet factam, aut nondum Elapso, aut vix Elapso primo seculo, Tom. 2. Lib. 10. Cap. 6. §. 24.

BUT this *INEQUALITY*, acknowledged by Chamier to §. III. have so soon obtain'd, was only an *INEQUALITY* of *Dignity*, a *Priority* of *Order*, not of *Jurisdiction*. So it is said by G. R. (b) but purely at Random. For y nothing can be plainer than that Chamier allows an *INEQUALITY* of *POWER*, a *PRIORITY* of *JURISDICTION*, to have Commenced from the very time of the *INNOVATION*, as he calls it. I do not deny, says he, that Bishops got a *NEW POWER* and a *NEW JURISDICTION*, for otherwise their Episcopacy had been but a meer Title: For, so long as one was only a Presbyter, it is not likely that he had any Jurisdiction over either his Collegues or the whole Church; he got that only then when

(b) §. 11. p 13.

(i) accipere ta- be became FIRST or BISHOP. (i) This is more than enough
men novam to discuss all that G. R. has said; but it is not all I have
Potestatem ju- to say, for
risdictionem-
que non iverim inficias, ut ne esset Episcopatus merue Titulus ac Sane cum quis esset tan-
rum Pre-byter, non fuit verisimile ullam habuisse in suos Collegas, aut in universam Ecce-
ham, jurisdictionem; sed tantum cum fiebat Primus, i. e. Episcopus. Tom. 2. Lib. 10.
C. 3. §. 10.

§. IV. 2. CHAMIER plainly talks of an INNOVATION which
was made after the Times of the Apostles; by necessary
Consequence it could not be purely an *Impariety of Dignity*,
or a *Priority of Order* which he meant; unless G. R. will
affirm that Chamier did not understand the true Presbyterian
Principles, by which, a *Priority of Order and Dignity* is as
ancient as *Presbyteries* themselves, or, which is all one, as an-
cient as *Moderators*, without whom *Presbyteries* never were,
never could be.

§. V. THIS, That the Episcopacy introduced so soon after the
Apostles was an INNOVATION; a Recession from the Or-
der which obtain'd so long as the Apostles lived; and with-
al, that *Moderators* (who, as such, have still a *Priority of*
Order and Dignity) were Coeval with *Presbyteries*; This, I
say, is a Consideration of so great weight, that when it
is adverted to, it must needs shew the Impertinency of that
Distinction between *Priority of Dignity or Order*, and *Priority*
of *Power or Jurisdiction*, in most Cases, in which it is made
use of by G. R. and his Brethren: For how could it be
an Innovation? How a Recession from the Original Or-
der, if nothing more was conferred on Bishops or Mode-
rators than that which they had ever been in Possession of,
from the very first Institution of *Presbyteries*? This, I say,
over again, is of great weight and consequence; and I re-
quire G. R. and his Brethren hereafter to remember it, as
that which makes the aforesaid distinction Ridiculous in
most Cases. But is it indeed a Presbyterian Principle That
Moderators are as old as *Presbyteries*? If any Man doubts
of it, let him have recourse to the Margent for satisfaction. (k)

Quod Duo-
decim (Apostol-

rum habuerint inter se qui omnes regeret, nihil miremur. Hoc eni infert Natura,
hoc hominum ingenium postulat, ut in quovis Cœtu, etiam si æquales sint omnes pote-
tate, unus tamen sit velut Moderator in quem alii respiciant. Nulla est Curia sine con-
silio; nullus Confessus Judicium sine Prætoris, seu Quæstoris; Collegium nullum sine Præ-
fecto; nulla sine Magistro Societas. Calv. Instit. Lib. 4. Cap. 6. §. 8.

BUT

Essentiale fuit — quod ex Dei Ordinatione perpetua necesse fuit, est & erit, ut in Presbyterio quispiam & loco & Dignitate primus Actioni, gubernandæ præsit, cum eo quod ipsi attributum est divinitus jure. Beza contra Sarav. apud Sarav. p. 244.

Natura sola duce docemur ut omni Parium Cætui præsideat unus aliquis, in imparibus, summus. Sic Diocesani Episcopi Cæteris Episcopis longè impares, quia Superiores, Naturæ Lumine, presidentiam obtinent, idque sine Electione. And. Melvinus contra Tilenum Cap. 30. §. 1. And, Natura, Dei ipsius instinctu, Ordinis in omni cætu necessitatem nos docet, &c. Cap. 24. §. 6. vide etiam Cap. 16. §. 28.

Cum omnia communi Presbyterorum Consilio gerebantur, aureo illo Apostolorum seculo, Ordinis tamen Causa, aliquis semper præfuit. Didoclavus, Alt. Damas. p. 301.

Essentiale nobis est, quod ex Dei institutione nunquam abroganda necessarium semper fuit, semperque futurum est, cujusmodi est quod in Presbyterio quispiam & consilius & Sermone faciendi. *ᾠεγορία* primus, Actioni Moderandæ præesse debeat. Gersome Bucerus, de Gubernatione Ecclesiæ, Episcopi 80. p. 308. Et Episcopi 111. p. 411. Essentiale ac necessarium est in Ecclesiæ Politia, ut Presbyteri Communi Consilio Gubernationi vacent, & in eadem unus *ᾠεγορία* partibus fungatur. vide plura. pp. 19, 20. 253, 254. 301. 428. 580. 589, &c.

Collegium, i. e. ordinatus ratione utentium Cætus, sine ordine nec institui, nec conservari, nec agere, nec agi, (amplius dicam) nec cogitari potest; Bondellus Apol. pro sent. Hieron. p. 52. while Discourfing of the necessity of a Moderator, &c.

Partem unam veluti, seponi debere penes quem sit totius Congregationis Regem, & ipsa rerum Natura vult, & exempla suadent omnium talium Congregationum. Natura rerum primum: Qui enim vel multorum Suffragia Commode colligi, vel loquendi ac tacendi vices convenienter assignari, vel itata Conveniendi tempora condici denique possent, nisi aliquis in Cætu emeretur cui universa ista Moderatio committeretur? &c. Amyraldus Th. Salm. part 3. Disp. 38. §. 10.

Paria habet Lud. Capellus ibid part. 3. Disp. 22. §. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

Johannes Hoornbeek (Dissert. de Episcopatu) non solum, pro necessitate Ordinis in Conventibus & Gerendis Negotiis Moderatorem requiri ait p. 29, 30. Verum etiam p. 40. hæc illius verba sunt, certe in Collegiis, si habentur *Ευαγελιστας* & *ἡγούμενος*, præsidem esse aut Constitui oportet. Imo hoc auctore teste, Hæc omnium Ecclesiarum, Confessionem Helveticam agnoscentium, fides; Ex ea enim Confessione ille, hæc p. 58. Interea propter ordinem servandum, unus aut certus aliquis Ministrorum cætum Convocavit, & in Cætu res Consultandus proposuit, sententias item aliorum Collegit; Denique ne qua Oriretur Confusio pro virili cavit. Sic Legitur fecisse in Actis Apostolorum S. Petrus. Confes. Helvet. Cap. 18.

Quia vero in omni Cætu, ut vitetur Confusio, necesse est dari ordinem aliquem inter ejus Membra, Ideo inter Presbyteros dabatur primus aliquis, &c. Turretinus Inst. Theol. Elenct. part. 3. Loc. 18. Quest. 21. §. 13.

It were easie to multiply Testimonies to this purpose; but I shall only adduce two others to complete the Dozen.

Mr. Foxrester in his Hierarchical Bishops Claim part. 1. p. 54. thus, as to the Office of a President or Moderator, whose work is to be the Mouth of the Meeting, to gather the Votes, and Moderate the Procedures, we hold that the very Nature of all Government essentially requires this, and consequently Church Government; and that this was always and necessarily practised, as in all Church Government, so, since the beginning and is Exemplified in that first Christian Council Act 15. &c.

And even G. R. himself is as positive as any Man; for he tells us. (True Representation of Presbyterian Government, prop. 14.) That it is one of the Dictates of Natural Reason (which is also a Beam of Divine Light) That one preside in all Church Meetings; and it is as unreasonable to require positive Assertions of Scripture to warrant this, as to call

call us to bring Texts to prove that we should come to the publick Assemblies Cloathed and not Naked, &c.

§. VI.

BUT does not *Chamier* say, *There was no Domination allowed in the Church?* does he not prove that *the Government of the several Churches of old was Aristocratical?* Does he not affirm that

(l) Cyp. B. Ex.
§. 11. p. 13.

Bishops were not Monarchs but chosen Princes, &c. (l) yes, he says so, what then? will it hence follow that he made Bishops and Presbyters to have acted in *Parity*, ever after the *Distinction* of their *Offices*? To say so is inconsistent with what I have already cited from him. (m) As to the point of *Aristocracy*, he himself most plainly unriddles the Matter, by giving us to understand that by *Aristocratical Government* he means no more than that *Bishops* were not *Absolute* and *Arbitrary Lords*, and that *Presbyters* were not *excluded* from all share of the Govern-

(n) ab initio e-
undem fuisse
ordinem sed po-

stica mutatum. & sic tamen mutatum, ut non imponeretur reliquis Presbyteris DOMINOS sed duntaxat 'Εὐαγγέλιος gratia unus reliquis præfesset, ut tamen Communi Consilio omnes Ecclesiam Administrarent, quod est Aristocraticum Tom. 2. Lib. 10.

§. VII.

AN easie Composition of a little skill in Latine, and a proportionable Dose of Ingenuity had prevented all such feeble Reasonings. For it is plain that *Chamier* meant the same very thing when he used the Word MONARCHA that he meant when he used the Word DOMINUS; that is, he never intended by either to exclude *Imparity* between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*. He intended only the exclusion of *Absolute* and *unlimited Power*; of *despotick Power*, as they call it; of such *Power* as the DOMINI among the *Romans* had over their SERVI. This I desire G. R. and all his Brethren hereafter to take notice of; and to remember that when they use the Phrase of *Church Denomination* to bring an *Odium* upon the Government of Bishops (which Phrase G. R. has very frequently in his Writings; 8 or 9 times in his *Cyprianic Bishops Examind* (o). They must be either very *Disingenuous*, or very ignorant of the proper import of such a Phrase: For I do tell them over again, that they may the better mind it, that in the propriety of the Latin Tongue, the Word DOMINUS signifies an *absolute Lord* or *Master* of *Slaves*; and the Word DOMINATIO imports *despotic Power*, the *Power* that such *Lords* had over their *Slaves*: By

(o) p. 11, 12.
13. 36. 47. 78.
92. 94.

Con-

Consequence, such Terms cannot, without manifest Absurdity, be applied to Christian Bishops, at least, so long as they keep within the Bounds which the Laws of God and his Church have prescribed to them. That such are the True, Genuine, Proper Significations of these Words, G. R. if he pleases, may learn from the Margent (o).

(1) Apparet
SERVUM hunc

esse DOMINI pauperis miseriq; Terent. Eunuch. A. 3. S. 2. Ψ 33. Nam is mihi profecto est SERVUS spectatus satis, cui DOMINUS curæ est. Adelp. A. 5. S. 6. Ψ 6. 57. And Adeip. A. 1. S. 2. Ψ 50, 51. He manifestly distinguishes between a DOMINUS and a PATER, whom, yet, I hope G. R. will not deny to be Superiour even in Power, to his Children. Hoc Patrum est potius Consuefacere filium sua sponte recte facere, quam alieno Metu. Hoc PATER ac DOMINUS interest.

SERVI ære parati injusta imperia Dominorum non perferunt, says Memmius apud Salust. Bel. Jugurth. p. 261. Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1654. And Marius (ibid p. 344.) makes a mighty difference between a General ———— of an Army, and a Lord, tho' if I mistake not, it is not necessary that a general Act in Parity with his Inferiour Officers. Namq; cum tute per Mollitiem agas, exercitum Supplicio Cogere, hoc est DOMINUM non IMPERATOREM esse. And Lepidus (ibid. inter fragm. p. 443) as plainly distinguishes between DOMINUS and PRINCEPS mihi quidem satis Spectatum est Pompeium tantæ Gloriæ adolescentem malle PRINCEPEM volentibus vobis esse quam illis DOMINATIONIS Socium.

Curtius (lib. 8. cap. 7.) brings in Hermolaus discoursing thus to Alexander, Occidende Consilium inivimus quia non ut ingenuis imperare cæpisti, sed quasi in MANCIPIA DOMINARIS. And after Alexander's Death (lib. 10. Cap. 5) Persæ justissimum & mitissimum DOMINUM, Macedones optimum & fortissimum REGEM invocantes, certamen quoddam mæoris edebant.

Gracchus profugiens, (Vell. Patere. Edit. Antwerp. 1627. p. 25.) cum jam Comprenderetur ab iis quos Opimius miserat, cervicem Euporo SERVO præbuit, qui non segnius se ipse interemit quam DOMINO Succurrerat. And p. 49. Apertè deinde Antonii ac Dolabella Consulium ad nefandam DOMINATIONEM erupit furor. And Torpebat oppressa DOMINATIONE Antonii Civitas.

Cæsar also still uses the Word in the same sense, thus, De Bello Gall. Lib. 6. p. 224. Edit. Amstelodami. 1661. in omni Gallia, eorum hominum qui aliquo sunt numero atque honore, genera sunt duo, nam plebs pene SERVORUM habetur loco — plerique cum aut ære alieno aut Magnitudine tributorum, aut injuria Potentiorum premuntur se in SERVITUTEM dicunt nobilibus; in hos eadem omnia sunt jura quæ DOMINUS in SERVOS.

Cicero affords plenty of Testimonies to this purpose. Vide Orat. secundam pro Sexto Roscio Amerino. §. 120. Epist. Famil. Lib. 10. Ep. 31. Lib. 12. Ep. 3. Tuscul. Quest. Lib. 3. §. 41. It is a notable passage which we have in an Epistle written by Brutus to Albius (inter Ciceronis Epistolas ad Brutum Lib. 2.) where, writing concerning Antonius his attempting to raise himself to an Absolute Power; he, thus. Quin cum ipsa re bellum geram, hoc est, cum Regno, & imperiis extraordinariis, & DOMINATIONE, & potentia quæ supra leges se esse velit. Nulla erit tam bona Conditio SERVIENDI qua non deterrear, quamvis sit vir bonus, ut Scribis, Antonius, quod ego, nunquam existimavi. Sed DOMINUM ne PARENTEM quidem Majores Nostri voluerunt esse. To cut short, for it would be endless to Cite all Authors, which might easily be done.

It is observable that Augustus, Tiberius, Trajanus, Alexander Severus, all the good or wise or cunning Roman Emperours did still refuse the Title of DOMINUS. None took

it kindly from their greatest Parasites, but such Monsters as Caligula, or Nero or Domitian or Diocletian. DOMINI appellationem ut maledictum & opprobrium semper exhorruit, n. Augustus (*says Suetonius of him Cap. 53. and he goes on*) Cum, spectante eo ludos, pronunciatum esset in Mimo, O DOMINUM æquum & bonum, & Universi quasi de ipso dictum exultantes Comprobassent, & statim manu vultuque indecoras adulationes repressit, & insequente die gravissimo Corripuit Edicto, DOMINUMQUE se posthac appellari, ne a liberis quidem aut Nepotibus suis, vel serio, vel joco, passus est.

DOMINUS appellatus (Tiberius) a quodam, denunciavit ne se amplius Contumeliæ causa Nominaret. *Idem in Tib. Cap. 27. And it is a famous saying of the same Tiberius's which Dion Cassius has Recorded (Lib. 57. p. 607. Edit. Hanovix 1606) ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὴν τῆς Γερμανίας, καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον, καὶ ὑφ' αὐτοῦ ὄνομα ζετοῦ; καὶ πολλὰ καὶ γὰρ ἔλεγεν ἐπὶ Δεσπότης μὴ τῶν Δέλων, Αὐτοκράτωρ, δε τῶν στρατιωτῶν, τῶν δὲ δὴ λοιπῶν, πρέκειτος εἰμι.* Principisque Senatus, more antiquo, Nomen ipse sibi tribuebat, Sæpius dicens DOMINUM se SERVORUM, IMPERATOREM MILITUM, PRINCIPEM CÆTERORUM esse.

DOMINUM se appellari vetuit *says Lampridius of Alexander Severus. Cap. 4. p. 885. Edit. Ludg. Bat. 1672.*

As for Trajan, he was so far from assuming to himself the Title of DOMINUS, that if we may believe Sex. Aur. Victor, he called himself only a Moderator. Usque in eo innocentia fidens, uti præfectum Prætorio Saburnum Nomine, cum insigne Potestatis, uti mos erat, pugionem daret, Crebro monuerit; tibi istud ad Munimentum mei Committo, si recte agam: sin aliter, in me magis, quod MODERATOREM omnium vel errare minimè fas sit. *And it is remarkable that Pliny in his excellent Panegyrick on the same Trajan does not so much as once call him DOMINUS, but all along PRINCEPS (The ordinary Title given to the Emperours, by Tacitus, Suetonius, and all others who have written about them) so he indeed calls him more than a 100 times in that one Oration. Nay, comparing him with Domitian, he says, They had changed a LORD for a PRINCE. Non enim de Tyranno sed de cive, non de DOMINO sed de PARENTE loquimur. (p. 327. Edit. Lug. Bat. 1640) And p. 332. non enim SERVULIS tuis DOMINUM — sed PRINCIPEM CIVIBUS daturus Imperator. And p. 361. Scis ut sicut diversa natura DOMINATIO & PRINCIPATUS, ita non aliis esse PRINCIPEM Gratiorem quam qui maximè DOMINUM graventur. And p. 371. Hic (Trajanus) regnum ipsum, quæq; alia Captivitas Gignit, arcet ac summovet, sedemque obtinet PRINCIPIS ne sit DOMINO locus. On the other Hand,*

Suetonius frequently reproaches Caligula with DOMINATION, particularly Cap. 10. & 47. And Cap. 49. to his perpetual infamy, he says, of him Edixit & reverti se sed iis tantum qui optarent, Equestri Ordini & Populo: Nam se neque Civem neque PRINCIPEM senatui amplius fore. And of NERO (Cap. 35.) Libertos divites & senes, olim adoptionis, mox DOMINATIONIS suæ fautores atque rectores, veneno partim cibis, partim portionibus indito, interceptit. And Cap. 37. Elatus negavit quemquam PRINCIPUM scisse quid sibi liceret, And of DOMITIAN (Cap. 13.) acclamari etiam in Amphitheatro, Epulari die, lubenter audit DOMINO & DOMINÆ sæliciter. But what was the result? See Cap. 14. which begins thus, propter hæc terribilis cunctis & invisus tandem oppressus est amicorum libertorumque intimorum Conspiratione. And Pliny (Lib. 4. Ep. 11.) says of him, Pontifices maximi jure seu potius immanitate Tyranni, Licentia DOMINI, reliquos Pontifices non in Regiam sed in Albanam villam Convocavit. And Lib. 8. Ep. 6.

Omitto quod Pullanti servo Prætoria Ornamenta offeruntur; quippe offeruntur a SERVIS and *ibid. Ep. 14.* Priorum temporum SERVITUS ut aliarum Artium optimarum, sic etiam juris Senatorii oblivionem quandam & ignorantiam induxit. And in his Panegyric p. 368. Ante quidem ingentes Hostiarum Greges per Capitolinum iter, magna sui parte velut intercepti, Divertere via Cogebantur, quum Sævissimi DOMIMI atrocissima effigies
tanto

tanto victimarum Cruore toleretur quantum ipse humani sanguinis profundeat. And p. 380 Hæc persuasio superbissimis DOMINIS erat, ut sibi viderentur PRINCEPES esse definere si quid facerent tanquam Senatores. And

As for Diocletian, Sex. Aur. Victor (*De Cæsaribus*) having given an account of diverse bad enough things about him, at length, adds, *Levia tamen præcæteris namque se primus omnium Caligulam post, Domitianumque, DOMINUM palam dici passus, & adorari se appellarique uti Deum.* Such were the Emperours who assumed to themselves, or received from others the Title of DOMINUS.

It would be endless (as I have said) to adduce all that might be found to this purpose in Livy, Seneca, Tacitus, Florus and many others of the best Roman Authors. See Gro-tius De jure Belli Lib. 3. Cap. 14. §. 5. where you have enough to satisfy your farther Curiosity. What I have adduced is enough, perhaps more than enough for my Design. For, from what I have cited, it is evident that in the true Roman Dialect, a DOMINUS is quite another thing than Father, King, General, Prince, Emperour, &c. all which, nevertheless, have some more than bare Priority of Dignity with regard to their Correlatives. To conclude, therefore let G. R. and his Brethren either prove that the Roman Emperours who refused to be called DOMINI, and satisfied themselves with the more gentle and civil Name of PRINCEPES; where only MODERATORS of the Senate, had only a Priority of Dignity and Order, without any Imparity of Power, or let them hereafter abstain from the improper, impertinent, Calumnious phrase of Church Domination, Improper, I say, Impertinent and Calumnious, as apply'd to Christian Bishops, who do not, cannot, never did, never could pretend to any Domination.

BLONDEL is the next I named; How G. R. has treat-§. VIII. ed me for naming him, I have already accounted. (p) But (p) § 1. c. if I can Demonstrate 1. that either G. R. has not Read *Blondel*, or (which is nothing better) has not understood him: And 2 That *Blondel* has both most fully and most frequently acknowledged that there was real Prelacy in St. Cyprian's time, I think I shall be sufficiently avenged of him.

I. EITHER G. R. has not read *Blondel*, or he has not §. IX. understood him. This appears from what he hath said about him, viz. That the whole Design and strain of *Blondel's* Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi is to prove that Episcopus and Presbyter were the same as both in NAME and POWER in the Apostolic Age of the Church, so, in POWER in the First, Second, Third, and much of the Fourth Century; tho' he confesses that the NAME and some MAJORITY (not HIGHER JURISDICTION was sooner given to the Bishop. (q) Now, I shall (q) §. 12. p. 13, not at present enter upon any troublesome Enquiry about the Nature of this SOME MAJORITY which yet is not HIGHER JURISDICTION; tho', considering what hath been already said (r) G. R. may fix some Difficulties about it; and (r) §. 3. tho' *Blondel* would have certainly laugh'd at him, had he heard him talking so: *Blondel* I say, who reckons it Ridiculous to attempt to separate Presidency from Authority, or Governing

(s) Quot quot *Power*. (s) Not to insist on this (I say) I do affirm that we Presbyteros sub have here very fair Evidence That G. R. (allowing him Episcopis, jure to be a Man of common Ingenuity) when he wrote so, Divino, Consti- was very much a stranger to *Blondel's* Book, at least, to tutos, illorum- the sense and purpose of it: For who so shall consider it, que Consilio, shall find it manifestly false, that *Blondel* either affirms or sed sine aucto- attempts to prove that *Episcopus* and *Presbyter* were the ritate ipsismet same in POWER in any of the named Centuries. propria, ab his Ecclesias regi debere putant, vel pueris Ludibrium debeant Necesse est: Quis enim Præfidentiam sine Auctoritate somniet, cum Præfidentiam ab ipsa Regendi auctoritate nullatenus differre noverint qui Nondum ære lavantur? *Apol. pro Sant. Hieron.* p. 39.

§. X.

BLONDEL's plot (in short) is plainly to justify the Constitution of those Churches, which are Govern'd without Bishops; to maintain the *validity* of their *Orders*, and, by consequence, of their *Sacraments*, and other Ministerial Performances; or in other Words, That their *want* of *Bishops* does not *unchurch* them. Now, as it was not necessary for serving this Design to state the Controversie, he was chiefly to manage, upon the Point of *Parity* or *Imparity*; (which I shall hereafter prove to be the true state of the Controversie between us and our Brethren) So neither has he done it, any where, in all his Book. The great Question which he Ventilates, and whereof he always maintains the Affirmative, is, whether *Bishops* and *Presbyters* do *Originally* make but *one Order*? which is indeed little *better* than a School nicety; and when sifted to the bottom, will be found little other than a Controversie about *Words*. But whatever be of this, I do again affirm that this is the great Controversie that is pursued by *Blondel*, as it were easie to shew most fully. Who so has leisure and Abilities for Reading such a Book, if he reads it with Attention, shall be sure to find this to be his *chief aim* from one end of it to the other. He who is not willing to Read so much may consult p. 5, 6. 32. 33, &c. of the Preface; and of the Book p. 1. 31, 32. 37. 43, 44. 52. 60, 61. 65. 68, 69. 70, 71, 72, 73, 74. 77. 90. 141, 142, 143. 155. 157, 158. 174. 190, 191, 192, 193. 287. 316. 347. 363, 364, 365. In each of which, (besides many more) he may find *Blondel* either in expresse terms affirming, or by fair Consequence implying, that this is his great Business. The Reader who has not opportunity to read such a Book; may take the following account of Mr. *Blondel's* Scheme.

I. HE

I. HE is most positive and peremptory that there were *constant Moderators* from the very *beginning*; fix'd *Presidents* of *Presbyteries* from the very first *Erection* of *Presbyteries*. This he lays such stress on, as to tell plainly, that without it, it is not possible to evite insuperable Difficulties. (1) I suppose, (2) Quod, (se-
he meant that this was absolutely necessary for Eviting of *two* niorem, Pres-
distinct Orders, one of *Bishops*, the other of *Presbyters*, from the byterum, qua-
Beginning. talem, & τῇ

successione) alta mente repositum teneant velim, quotquot (dum in veteres Ecclesiarum Primaria-
rum, Romanæ Antiochenæ, &c. tabulas incidunt in hunc unum successions Ordinem
quem nunc usitatum vident, oculis defixis hærent, usq; dum improvisis difficultatibus ob-
ruantur; Hæc enim una (si quid capere valeo) se ex ejusmodi salebris expediendi via
commoda suppetit, si quam supra de *Seniorum* sub Apostolis Apostolicisq; viris & *Prima-*
tu & *Successione* Hypothesein statuimus — fundamenti loco sternal. *Præf.* p. 7.

2. HE makes those *constant Moderators* to have succeeded, §. XII.
at first, according to their *Seniority*. He that was first or-
dain'd a *Presbyter* did, as such, *succeed* to the *Chair* without
more ado, without any farther Solemnity or Ceremony of
either Election or Consecration. This is so plainly and fre-
quently asserted, and so laboriously attempted to be prov'd
by him (tho' I am confident, without success) that it is
needless to spend more Words about it. Having laid these
Foundations, he reckons

3. THAT it follows by necessary Consequence, That §. XIII.
such Churches as want *Bishops* of any Order distinct from that
of *Presbyters*, have all that is necessary to constitute them
true Churches, if they have *Presbyters*: Having these, they
have all that the Churches of the first *Erection* had. Such
Churches have only resum'd the *Original Form*, and return'd
to the *Primitive Constitution*: Their Orders therefore are valid
and all regular Acts which proceed from them. This is *Blon-*
dels Scheme. For, That he never so much as once intend-
ed to controvert the lawfulness of *Imparity* or *real Prelacy* in
the *Practice* of Church Government; that he never so much
as once Dream'd of making the Government of the Church
administred by Pastors acting in *Parity*, an *unalterable Insti-*
tution, is evident as light from many Considerations, particu-
larly

I. AS he Entitled his Book *An Apology for St. Jerom's* §. XIV.
Opinion, so all along he affirms that he is only Explaining
and Defending that Opinion. Now it is certain, St. *Jerom*
never pleaded for the *unalterable Right* of *Parity*. Indeed
Blon-

Blondel purges Jerom of Arianism, upon this very score That
[u] Pref. p. 59. he was not (as Arianus) an Enemy to Prelacy. (u)
fused.

2. HIS Concessions of the lawfulness of Episcopacy are both
plain and numerous. You have a taste of them on the
(u) Blondel Margent (u) But this is not all. For
most clearly

Condemns these Qui rem ipsam, Episcopatum, a vitiis adnatis nequaquam distinguunt — sed primam illam Electorum κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, Presbyterorum, qui postea, restricto vocabuli usu, Episcopi dicti sunt, a sanctis Dei Martyribus Promanantem institutionem, ut puram purum Antichristianismum (præter meritum) exhorrent, nec sine Corruptelis, quas primis institutoribus imputare audent, extitisse unquam putant. Pref. p. 50. And p. 51. Cum igitur suo res quæq; pretio æstimanda veniat Episcopatum (qua Presbyterio Supereminet) verios ac proprius honor manere debeat, ut Ecclesiastica Constitutio (quod revera est) habeatur, &c.

In the Book it self, p. 53. Hanc Originalem Ecclesiasticæ Politicæ formam sub Apostolorum Oculis natam — fac Apostolis non modo Improbantibus sed palam laudantibus Ortam, Ego sane libere ab initio observatam, Christianisq; sive ab Apostolis, sive ab eorum Discipulis traditam, sed ut mutabilem, & pro usu ac arbitrio Ecclesiæ mutandum Crediderim. So he talks of his own fancied Model. And

Pag. 193. Unicus enim ubiq; est, fuitq; ab initio Christianorum Episcopatus quem Christi (sive revera sive in speciem) servi non qua υπερέχοντες Collegarum Præsules & Presbyteriorum præpositi, sed qua Presbyteri πρεσβυτεῖω ἐγκρατεχθόντες Presbyteriorum albo adscripti administrarunt; ut ἐπισκοπή, per se Considerata, ad Ecclesiæ Regimen absolutè, ἐπισκοπή annexa υπερχῇ, ad Regiminis Modum, solamq; ἐνταξίαν pertineat; quam suo semper arbitrio permittam, Seculorum omnium Credidit Ecclesiæ: Nec opus sit vel ad Triplices Episcopatus (Divini Sciz. humani & Satanic) distinctionem Confugere, vel quicquid humana Christum profitentium Consuetudo in divinorum usu ausa est, nefas putare: Cum, lege fidei manente, cætera jam Discipline & Conversationis admittere Novitatem Correctionis, suasq; in rebus hujusmodi, Christianæ prudentiæ partes obire licere in Confesso sit; Nec ulla (etiam nunc Ecclesiæ) in exemplum trahi possit quæ ex Generali hoc Divini juris præcepto, πάντα ἐνταξίως ὡς καὶ τὰ ξίη γενέσθω, quæcunq; & Decentiora & Commodiora sequendi plenam sibi potestatem factam non censeat. Vide *plura* p. 54. 157. 364.

Indeed he most zealously Condemns all Seperation, all breach of Peace and Church Communion upon the account of Episcopacy, in his Preface p. 59. and most fully in his Book p 179, 180. And it is a memorable account which Dr. Peter du Moulin, the Son, gives about him in a Letter to Dr. Durel, and Publish'd by this Dr. in his view of the Government and Publick Worship of God in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, p. 339, 340. where Moulin tells that Blondel had concluded his *Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi* with Words to this purpose, By all that we have said to assert the right of the Presbytery, we do not intend to invalid the Ancient and Apostolical Constitution of Episcopal Preeminence: But we believe that wheresoever it is Established, Conformably to the ancient Canons, it must be carefully preserved; and wheresoever, by some heat of Contention or otherwise, it hath been put down or violated, it ought to be reverently restored. And that by the vehemency and unwearied Importunities of the Scots especially, he was prevailed with to put out that Conclusion. This, I say, is Memorable; for it is unquestionably true, as appears by the Letter; and it gives us Blondel's Opinion not only of the Lawfulness, but also of the Preferableness of Episcopacy to any other form of Government.

3. BLONDEL in most Express Terms, makes an *Im-* (*v*) *fuitque tunc*
parity, or *Majority* of *Power* intrinsic to the Notion of his (*n, ab ipsis Apo-*
constant Moderator or *President*; of him who, at the begin- *stolorum tempo-*
ning was promoted to his *Chair* by his *Seniority*: So that, ac- *ribus)* *αἰσαία*
cording to his *Scheme*, The Primitive Church was never Go- *illa Seniorum e-*
vern'd by *Pastors* acting in *Parity*. He says, his *constant* *iq; adnexa SiN-*
President had a *singular* and *Peerless Power* (*v*) He had not *GULARIS* *Squæ-*
only the *Chair* but the **CHIEF POWER** in the *Presbyte-* *dam & EXORS*
ry. (*w*) he was *Head* of the *College* (*x*) and had a *Primacy* (*qualis Præsi-*
(y) the *rest* of the *Presbyters* freely conferr'd on him the *dentium omni-*
Honour of the **CHIEF POWER** as well as the **CHIEF** *um quo modo-*
Chair (*z*) And I hope this imports something more than *tutorum fuit &*
a Priority of *Dignity* or *Order*. Nay, as he was *President,* *erit semper)*
as he had the *Prerogative* of the **CHIEF POWER** and *POTESTAS*
Chair, as he was *Fratrium* *ἐξαρτος*, i. e. the *Prince* or *Captain* *non Presbyterio*
of the *Brethren*, he *neither* had nor could have any *Colleagues*; he *Major Ordo, sed*
could have none but *Successors*. (*a*) And a great deal more *Presbyterio in-*
to this purpose. And it is observable that he does not (as *ter* *δυναμὴς*
some, most groundlessly) make the *Apocalyptic Angels* to *fungentis ætati*
whom the *Epistles Rev. 2* and *3* were directed, *Collective* *debita proprio*
Bodies, but *single Persons*, *Persons* who had, so far, the *(si loqui fas sit)*
CHIEF POWER, that they were peculiarly *Chargeable* with *natalium*
the Enormities committed in the *Respective Churches* over which *Christo jure,*
they Presided. (*b*) This I say is observable, because our *prærogativa.*
Presbyterian Brethren cannot honestly deny it to be a so- *Præf. p. 6. (w)*
lid Evidence of *Blondel's* acknowledging those *Presidents* to *ibid. 7. (x) ibid.*
have had a *Majority* of *Power*, when they remember that *28. (y) ibid. 33.*
to avoid the necessary inference of such a *Majority*, they *(a) Linus qua*
have found it needful to deny that those *Angels* were *single* *Collegii Sacri*
Persons, and to make them to have been *Collective Bodies.* *Senior prima*
Neither is it of any weight against what I have said, that *Cathedra dona-*
Blondel sometimes seems to affirm that those *Presidents* act- *tus, fratrumque*
ed in *Parity* with the rest of the *College*: For more than *ἐξαρτος Colle-*
once he hath sufficiently Explain'd himself, by telling us, *gas nullos ha-*
That they were all *Equal*, indeed, as to the *Order*, which *buit aut habere*
was one and the same in all; all of them had the *Habitual* *potuit sed suc-*
Power, the *Actus Primus*, as they call it, in *Parity*; But *cessores tan-*
they were not *Peers* in the *Exercise* of it. In the *actual* *tum. Præf. p.*
Administration of that *Power*, the *President* had a notorious *35. (b) ad hos*
Chiefly, a *Majority*; he was distinguish'd from and eminent *presbyteriorum*
above the rest of the *College.* Indeed *præpositos, con-*
fluente (ex
Communi Col-
legiarum Con-
sensu) *primâ*
Ecclesiæ cujus-
que Cærâ, cum
& publice in
Collectis, sedu-
lis universam

fraternitatem hortamentis, ad bonum pietatis Certamen, fideq; Charitatis Obsequia excitare, eandem precibus Deo Commendare, Ordinis Confessus Cogere, omnibusque exemplo præire ex Officio tenerentur; ac se. pro virili, Dei ad homines Nuncios præstare, his ceu *ἑαγγορις* Commissi Gregis tam *ἡγορηματα* quam pudenda ex æquo imputari potuere, & a Domino ipso Ecclesiarum Asiaticarum Angelos cælestibus monitis ad fidei Constantiam arman- te imputata sunt. *Præf. p. 6.*

§. XVII.

4. THAT I have truly represented *Blondel's Scheme*, and that he never intended to plead for *Parity*, is Demonstratively Evident from the Nature and Tendency of all the Arguments he brings for proving his side of the Controversie. To prove that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* did not make *different Orders*; and not that they had not *different Powers*, is, and only can be the purpose of the pitiful Argument (he so much insists on) taken from the *DICHOTOMY* of the Clergy into the *Two Orders* of *Priests*, and *Deacons*. For that he did not so copiously and zealously insist on that Argument to prove that the Church was Govern'd by *Pastors* acting in *Parity*, is so clear that it requires no Proof. In short, for proving his point, whatever it was, he has Collected a Train of Testimonies, not from the Fathers of the *first three*, and much of the *Fourth*, (as *G. R.* either ignorantly or disingenuously misrepresents the Matter) but from both *Fathers* and *Councils*, from the *Apostles* down, to the end of the *ninth Century*. And not only so, but he farther tells he had in readiness to be produc'd, for confirming his side of the Controversie, the Testimonies of about 36 *Popish Authors*, among whom *divers Cardinals*, (c) and two or three *Popes*. (d) nay, he is at pains to reconcile his *Scheme* and *Principles* with the *Council of Trent* it self. (e) Now I am not to deny that his Undertaking was *odd* enough, and all along *oddly* enough mannag'd; but certainly it had been something more than *oddness* to have attempted to have made not only all the *Fathers* and *Councils* of the *First Nine Centuries*, but also so many *Popes* and *Cardinals*, and even the *Council of Trent*, Advocates for *Scottish Presbytery*; i. e. for a Government of the Church administred by *Pastors* acting in *Parity*. And now, by this short account I have given of Mr. *Blondel's Scheme* and Controversie; the Reader may judge, whether *G. R.* had read *Blondel's Preface* and Book, or, having read them, whether he had understood them, when he affirmed that *Blondel's Design* was to prove that *Bishop and Presbyter were the same in POWER* in the First, Second,

(c) *Præf. p. 61.*

(d) *ibid. p. 61.*

(e) *ibid. 62. 63.*

Second, Third and much of the Fourth Centuries. Indeed.

SOME Pages of *Blondel's* Book G. R. seems to have read, §. XVIII. which either he has not understood at all, or he must be very disingenuous. He affirms, (f) that *Blondel* says, that *Je-* (f) §. 12. p. 14. *rom's* *Toto Orbe decretum est ut unus de Presbyteris Cæteris super poneretur* was *quarto a Corinthiorum turbis Seculo*; and that he, *Blondel*, proves it from *Jerom's* own Words, which are, *quando non idipsum omnes loquimur, & alius dicit, Ego, sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego Caphæ, dividimus Spiritus unitatem, & eam in partes & in membra discerpimus. And he, the same Blondel, saith that* *Jerome* torquebat verba *Paulina* de *Corinthiis*, in eos: *Nempe sui temporis homines. Nothing I say, but Ignorance or Disingenuity, both Qualities mis-* becoming any Controvertist, especially a proclaimed Champion for a Church, could have prompted G. R. to affirm so. For *Blondel* never said so, never thought so; as, I am Confident, will convincingly appear to every Man of common Sense who shall Read and Understand all that *Blondel* hath said in this Matter, which I have faithfully transcribed on the Margent. (g) And so I proceed

(g) *Consuetudo illa* (n, quâ *Epif-*

copi, Hieronymo, Presbyteris majores, &c.) non ex quo primum inter Corinthios auditum fuit, Ego sum Pauli, &c. sed Paulatim invaluit. Quod adversus eos diligentius notandum venit quos Hieronymianæ Phrasæ Nudo Cortici eo sine in hære mordicus juvat, quo liberius a clarissimi Scriptoris mente aberrare sinantur. Ut ut enim Apostolis vel auctoribus vel Consciis Superpositos Presbyteris Episcopos autument, eos Circumstantes undiq; Paulinæ Historiæ Characteres revincunt. — Meminerit in super veri Studiosus Lector, nequaquam Hieronymum vel Scripsisse vel Scribere Cogitasse, simulac Corinthi dictum fuit, Ego sum Pauli, toto Orbe decretum, ut unus de Presbyteris electus cæteris superponeretur, sed postquam id dictum in populis, id est, postquam alii passim Corinthiorum more dementati, in partes discerpti sunt; QUOD ANTE ANNUM 140 EVANGELISSE, IDONEE VIX QUISQUAM PROBAVERIT. Observandum deniq; eodem fere (ex Hieronymi mente) sensu de quibuscunq; Schismaticis dici quod Corinthiis proprie conveniebat, quo de Chrysostomo cecidit cecidit Babylon; de palæstinis præsulibus, multi utroque claudicant pede; de Joanne Hierosolymitano, Capta Hierusalem tenetur a Nebuchodonosor, nec Hieremias vult audire Consilia; de Romano Clero, Phariseorum conclamavit Senatus; ab eodem Patre usurpatum legimus. Sic enim (quarto a Corinthiorum turbis seculo) de sui temporis hominibus, ait, quando non idipsum omnes loquimur, & alius dicit Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego Cephæ, dividimus Spiritus unitatem, & eam in partes & Membra discerpimus. Nemo (opinor) Anno 386 his verbis utebatur, quia tamen non deerant factiosi, qui Corporis Dominici compagem, qua Seditiosis clamoribus, qua flagitiosis molitionibus solverent, Paulina in eos de Corinthiis verba torquere non dubitavit Hieronymus. Hæc Blond. Apol. pro sent. Hieronymi. p. 3, 4.

§. XIX.

II. To the other thing I undertook to make appear, namely, That *Blondel* has most fully and most frequently acknowledged that Episcopacy was in the Church long before *St. Cyprian's* time. His acknowledgments indeed are so many that it were easie to fill many Pages with them. I shall content my self with such a competent number as may satisfy any Reasonable Man; even *G. R.* himself. Briefly then.

§. XX.

I. Doth not *Blondel* particularly fix the Year 140 as the time, in, or about which, Episcopacy was Introduced? Doth he not expressly say that *Ferom* allowed it to have been introduced; when, every where, the People, being Mad, after the example of the Corinthians, began to divide and separate from one another, which, says he, cannot be competently proved to have been before the Year 140? (b) And was not the Year 140? long before the Year 248? I know *G. R.* in his *Good old Way* defended (i) Chastises *A. M. D. D.* for adducing this Concession of *Blondel's*, and that he calls it a foul Misrepresentation. Why such hard Words? *Blondel* (forsooth) is there speaking of the Divisions in which one said, I am of Paul, &c. and that this could not be proved to be before the Year 140. Now it is probable (says *G. R.*) that Episcopacy as the supposed Remedy was not presently apply'd on the first appearance of the Malady; but that other means were used. But had *G. R.* done himself the Favour to have Read *Blondel's* Preface, he would have found that *A. M. D. D.* had made a very fair, a very just, a very cleanly Representation. He would have found *Blondel* p. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. very earnest to persuade his Reader that the change of Government was made at *Jerusalem* about the Year 135, or 136. and p. 17, 18, 19, 20. at *Alexandria*, about the Year 143. And p. 25, 26, 27, &c. at *Rome* about the Year 140.

§. XXI.

2. HOW frequently does *Blondel* acknowledg that Episcopacy was introduced in the Second Century? For this, let the plain Testimonies on the Margent be considered

(k) Quicquid (k).

Ordinariae fun-

ctionis ac *ἐπιτομῆς* iis (in quorum gratiam tituli Episcopalis reservatio primum facta est) competit, post Apostolorum omnium (sive ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς sive πλατυκῶς dictorum) decessum, ab Ecclesia SECUNDI SECULI (pro jure suo) libere Concessum fuit; ut vere καὶ ἀναμάρτητως, Consuetudine magis quam Dominicae dispositionis veritate, reliquis Presbyteris ad quos κοινῶς (ex Scripturarum mente) pertinebat Ἐπισκοπή, Majores factos scripserit Hieronymus. *Apol.* p. 86. — Post divisos Ecclesiarum SECUNDI SECULI Decreto, ab Episcopis Presbyteros — *ibid.* p. 92.

3. DOTH

Cum igitur anxie nunc queratur qua lege ac auctoritate, Ecclesiastica quedam Præ-
latis munera cum Pontificatus apice reserventur, tuta cum veteribus universis Conscientiâ
respondere licuerit, CANONICA, illa scilicet quæ, anno Circiter DUCENTESIMO, Presby-
teros Diaconosque non sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ Honorem, baptismum
dandi jus habere, Tertulliano persuasit. *Ibid.* p. 176.

Ubiq; tere ante SECUNDI SECULI finem admittit Episcopalis *ἐπισκοπή* *ibid.* p. 358.
Vide plura huc Spectantia p. 31, 32. 35. 37. 266. 294.

3. DOTH not Blondel make Ignatius's Epistles Counterfeit? §. XXII.
Is it not plain that the great Reason which moved him to do
so, was, that they were so favourable to Episcopacy? And
yet, doth he not allow them to have been forged about the
End of the Second Century? (l) Doth he not more than (l) *Pref.* p. 43.
once most plainly grant that Episcopacy was introduced be- 46. 49.
fore Tertullian wrote his Book about Baptism, which yet
He himself affirms to have been written Anno 197? (m) (m) — sed
nay, doth he not expressly tell us that about the Year 146 Mar- gliscente indies
cion was ambitious to have been promoted to the Roman Bi- longius a vere-
shoprick? (n) once more ri more (cujus
jam dudum fa-
stidium cæperat) abundi desiderio, sensim contrahi primæva libertas cæpit, non ejus a-
bolendæ, sed curandæ ne in vagam licentiam degeneraret, animo; Etiam si Episcopi Clero
universo præpositi & Presbyterorum totius Ecclesiæ decreto SUBDITORUM Commu-
nes functiones essent, nec HI quæ antiquo jure poterant, sine Episcopi auctoritate aggre-
diebantur, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo salva pax erat. Tert. de Baptismo Cap. 17.
Hæc Blond. *Pref.* p. 38, 39. *Vide etiam superius Citata* ex p. 176. §. XXI.

(u) De sede Romana per quadriennium Viduata invadenda Marcionem Cogitasse, &c.
Apol. p. 19. 20. Nec mirum Clarissima enim Epiphani's verba quem Blondellus citat se-
quiturque Ζήλω λοιπὸν ἐπαρθεὶς ὡς ἐν ἀπίστῳ τῷ πνεύματι, &c. *Epiph. Her.* 42.

4. HEAR him concerning St. Cyprian's time; particu- §. XXIII.
lariy, while he is discoursing concerning Fabianus his ordain-
ing Novatianus a Presbyter (which he makes to have been
done Anno 240 (o) i. e. 7 or 8 Years before St. Cyprian was (o) p. 328.
Bishop of Carthage) he grants that by the Custom then re-
ceived, the Bishop was the chief Governour; That all Acts
of Ecclesiastical Authority were directed by him; That he was
seated on the top of the Priesthood; and that by reason of
his PEERLESS and EMINENT Power, he was singularly
chargeable with, and accountable for mismanagements. (p) And, (p) in Ordina-
Discoursing of Novatus and his Complices, who were, as tionibus & Si-
much as Men could be, St. Cyprian's Contemporaries, he cris aliis functi-
says, in so many Words, That Presbyters were, then, by Custom, onibus, præci-
subject to Bishops. (q) And that Cyprian had Reason to re- puus Acter E-
sent the Behaviour of Presbyters, who, contrary to the Order then pi copus fuit;
non quia jure
receiv.

ullo five Divino received, presumed to act by themselves, without reserving to the five Apostolico Bishops, not only the Honour of his CHAIR but also of his ad *regediar* PRIESTHOOD. (r) Nay he makes the Episcopal Power to projectus Cre- have been as considerable, not only, in, but even before St. debatur, sed Cyprian's time, as it was in the Seventh Century (s). Farther quia per eum yet, he acknowledges that, in St. Cyprian's time, [and long omnem Eccle- before it, ever since the Distinction was made between Bi- lia Actum gu- lthops and Presbyters] Bishops and Presbyters were promoted by bernari, in A- Distinct Ordinations, and made distinct Colleges. (t) And where- PICE PONTI- as, during the First Constitution of Church Government, by FICATUS Col- which all Pastors were Equal, he affirms that Two Bishops locatum, suo & might very well have been at once in one City or Church, (u) Collegarum no- yet concerning St. Cyprian's time, he both affirms and proves, mine agere, ed- que Præcipu- um Actorem fieri. libere AS- CITO MORI placuerat Leges ab Episcopo pænas repeten- tes tanquam de uno loquutæ sunt; non ut Presbyteros, same DE JURE, of Right, with Bishops, altho' DE FACTO, CONSUETU- in Fact, they were so distinguished, that those who were EQUAL DINE MINO- in Function, were UNEQUAL in the Exercise of it. From RES, immunes which Words we have not only a fair acknowledgment of IMPARITY in St. Cyprian's time, but also a clear ac- ab iisdem præ- count of Blondel's main Controversie, viz. That he did not titarent, sed ut Episcopi cui EXORTEM & EMINENTEM POTESTA- Presbyter, but only for their making one and the same Or- TEM dederant, der, præcipue cul- pandam & plectendam *negropular* indicarent, nec facile evasuros MINORES, si PRÆ- CIPUOS (imo SUMMOS) fulgura Montes ferirent. *Apol. p. 347.*

(q) Nec proprie (*s. e. non solum*) ob Calcatum PONTIFICATUS APICEM, cui EX MORE SUBDEBANTUR, sed ob Prodirum Evangelium, Laicosque Fratres Exarlit. — *Apol. 297.*

(r) Quia insuper habita omni Consistorum Collatione, nec Episcopo HONOREM SACERDOTII sui ac CATHEDRÆ reservantes — intolerandam planè eorum auda- ciam merito censuit RECEPTI MORIS vindex Cyprianus. *Ibid. n. p. 297.*

(s) An solutio Cypriani ætate EPISCOPORUM POTESTAS quam vel ante fuerat, vel post, ad annum usq; Septingentesimum fuisse videatur? *Apol. p. 299.*

(t) Formam a præcedente (*n. formâ, quâ promovebantur Episcopi*) aliam, analogiâ eadem semper manente (ex quo Distinctis Cleri Gradibus, DIVERSA Episcoporum & Presbyterorum COLLEGIA instituere per Ecclesiam visum est) inducere necesse fuit. p. 162.

(u) Necdum duos, uno eodemq; loco, Episcopos sedere. *Antioch. vifum: fuerat. Praef. p. 6.*
 (v) Vide *Apol. p. 188, 189, fusi.*
 (w) Hic [RECEPTO JAM DUDUM MORE] Presbyteris PRÆPOSITUS. *Antioch. p. 41. Tante*
he had Superiour, tho' he claim'd not a Sole Power.
 (x) Uno verbo, idem [DE JURE] erant cum Episcopis Presbyteri, licet DE FACTO, ab invicem distinguerentur, ut qui REVERA munere PARES erant, Muneris UUUIM-PARES fierent. *Apol. p. 44.*

By this time, the Reader (especially if he Remembers §. XXIV what was discours'd §. 3. Concerning the necessity of Moderators, &c.) may judge whether *Blondel* acknowledged Episcopacy to have been in the Church in and before *St. Cyprian's* time: And by Consequence, whether *G. R.* had Reason to affirm that *Blondel* did not allow it to have got footing before *Jerom's* time, who, by *Blondel's* own reckoning, lived, at least 160 Years after *St. Cyprian*; and, whether he had reason to say that *either I had not read Blondel, but cited him at adventure, or that I have a Confidence to assert what I will, tho' absurd and unaccountable.* And so I leave *Blondel*.

SALMASIUS comes next to be considered. *G. R.* lays §. XXV I am as unhappy in him as in *Blondel*. I say, I am as happy as I could wish, if I am not unhappier. And I think my self so sure that I am not, that I will not produce the Tenth part of *Salmasius's* acknowledgments of the Prevalency of Prelacy in and before *St. Cyprian's* time. And yet I shall produce that which may be sufficient to put *G. R.* to the Blush, if he is capable of it. Particularly

1. IT is observable that *Salmasius*, most frequently de- §. XXVI clares, he shall be satisfied, if you grant to him, that Episcopacy was not instituted by the Apostles. Allow him that, and he can allow it to have been introduced, at any time, after their Decease. This he has many times over and over in his *Walo Messalinus* (y) as, indeed, no Author I (z) Vide P. (7) have ever Read has indulg'd himself more, in frequent and unnecessary Repetitions. But to go on. 117. 119. 122. 177. 181. 248. 283. 419. E- dit. Lugd. Bat. 1641.

2. MOST frequently he acknowledges that the Officers §. XXVII were Distinguished as soon as the Names were appropriated, viz. that of Bishop to the President, and that of Presbyter

to the rest of the Priests: Or rather, he makes the *Impro-
priation* of Names to have been *Posterior* to, and *founded*
upon the *Distinction* of the Offices. This I take to be ful-

(z) Cum pares essent omnes & in uno eodemq; gradu Constitute, dicebantur & omnes tam Episcopi quam Presbyteri, promiscue & indifferenter: Postquam Ordinum inductum est Discrimen, Nominum quoque Distinctio simul inducta est. Wal. Mess. p. 125. Ubi unus ex Numero plurium eligi Cæptus est qui omnibus preponeretur, non amplius Pristina *ÆQUALITAS* Servata est; & ab eo tempore Cæperunt Presbyteri *INFERIORES* esse Episcopis. Sic Cessarunt Antiquiores illi Episcopi: Tum enim Episcopus vocatus est qui multis Præerat; Presbyteri Nominati qui *UNI SUBERANT*; cum antea unus idemq; esset *RE* ac *POTESTATE* Episcopus & Presbyter, solo nomine Discrepantes. p. 287. Postquam rerum Distinctio facta est, tum etiam sequuta Nominum, ut oportuit, Discretio. Episcopi vocati sunt qui *PRÆERANT*, Presbyteri qui *SUBERANT*. p. 351. Rem verba sequuntur signant ac testantur. Cum Confuse erant Appellationes, etiam Officia indiscreta habita sunt, presbyteri & Episcopi. Ubi distingui cæpta sunt Vocabula, Distinctio illa Orta est ex rerum ipsarum & Numerum Discretione. p. 365. Vide plura. p. 366.

§. XXVIII. 3. IF G. R. will take *Salmasius's* Word for it, he may believe that Bishops and Presbyters had *distinct Ordinations*, and made *distinct Colleges*, as soon as the Offices were *Distinguished*, or the Names were *Impropriated*. (a) And if *distinct Ordinations* and *distinct Colleges* may not infer *IMPARITY*, I know not what may do it.

(a) cum Episcopus & presbyter idem essent, Ordinatio ad utrumque pertinuit, quia non alius a Presbytero Episcopus. Episcopus Ordinabat Presbyterum & Presbyter Episcopum, quia idem Ordo, idem Gradus utriusq; & unus fuit. Ubi distingui Ordines & Gradus Cæpti sunt, atq; Episcopus Major exitit Presbytero, tum Ordinatio non potuit esse utriusq; Communis: Ut enim Major Ordinaret Minorem, Superior inferiorem; ita e Contrario, Minor ordinare Majorem non potest, neq; inferior superiorem; Inde igitur postquam Minor Episcopo factus est Presbyter, ex Ordinum Discretione, non potuit Minor ordinare Majorem, hoc est, Presbyter Episcopum. Sic Episcopo Ordinatio propria facta est, & ad Presbyterum desinit pertinere, quia Presbyter desinit esse Episcopus Wal. Mess. p. 298, 299. Ex quibus verbis, *Uilo evidentiissime Consequuntur*. Unum, Presbyteros Ordinandi potestatem, post munerum distinctionem, ad Episcopos pertinuisse. Alterum, Episcoporum Ordinationem utpote quâ Presbyteros Ordinandi potestas Conferretur, a Presbyterorum Ordinatione fuisse diversam. Distincta etiam Episcoporum & Presbyterorum fuisse Collegia verbis disertissimis asserit p. 464. Alius ordo est [inquit] Episcoporum, alius Presbyterorum postquam ex uno Duo facti sunt. Et rursus p. 465. singula Distincta Corpora suum Ordinem fecerunt. Non Collegæ sunt Episcopi Presbyterorum post introductam Ordinum Distinctionem.

4. IF G. R. shall not be satisfied with this way of Reasoning, by Consequences; then I tell him that *Salmasius* in most exprefs terms acknowledges *Prelacy* to have been very early in the Church; very soon after the Apostles; very long before *St. Cyprian*. *Salmasius* I say, talking of *St. Polycarp's* Epistle to the Church of *Philippi*, observes, that after the Distinction was made between Bishops and Presbyters, no Example can be produced of any Epistle written by a Bishop, in the Inscription whereof, he joins his Presbyters with himself, as was done by *Polycarp*. And for Proof of this he Appeals to *St. Cyprian's* Epistles. Now what can be a clearer Concession, that the Orders or Colleges were different in *St. Cyprian's* time, if this is not? (b) he acknowledges *Episcopacy* to have been in *Tertullian's* time. (c) For he cites that famous Testimony *Dandi quidem jus*, &c. more than once or twice, and always understands it [not as G. R. has Ridiculously gloss'd it §. 49. p. 72. but] as all Men of Sense have ever understood it, that is, so as to import that Presbyters were then so much Subject to their Bishops that they could not Baptize [more than Deacons] without his Allowance; and all the Advantage he attempts to make of it, is, That *Tertullian* doth sufficiently insinuate that it was not by Divine appointment, but by Ecclesiastical Custom or Constitution, that the Bishop had such a Prerogative. He grants it to have been in *Clemens Alexandrinus's* time; [d] For, considering the Story which *Eusebius*, H. E. L. 3. C. 23. Transcribes from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, concerning the Apostle *St. John's* planting of Churches and Ordaining Bishops, &c. he says that *Clemens*, as was ordinary with the Greeks, had an Eye to the Custom of his own time, by which the singular Principality of Bishops was already introduc'd. Farther yet, Doth not *Salmasius* acknowledge that the Epistles commonly ascribed to *Ignatius* are very plain for Prelatick Government? Doth he not, chiefly for that very Reason, reject them as Spurious? And yet doth he not make them to have been forged about the Beginning, or at latest, the Middle of the Second Century, at which time was Introduced a singular Episcopacy above the Presbyterate? (e) Once more, Doth not this Learn'd Author most plainly allow the Order of Bishops as Contradistinct from that of Presbyters to be most Ancient, so very Ancient, that he only Excepts the times of the Apostles? [f]

SUCH

toritate Ecclesiæ introductam, satis clare innuit his verbis, *Dandi quidem Baptismi jus habet summus sacerdos qui est Episcopus, Dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi. non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ Honorem, quo salvo salva pax est. Walo Mess. p. 389. Vide etiam. p. 293 & 294. ubi post eadem allata Verba, Hæc de suo addit Salmasius Nec igitur hoc parvum Discrimen, Jus Baptismi dandi penes Episcopum esse, quod non sit penes Presbyterum nisi interveniente Episcopi auctoritate. At non hæc perpetuum fuit, neq; in omnibus Ecclesiis servatum est, Neq; a Principio ab Apostolis id institutum. Vide etiam p. 420, 421.*

(d) Clemens Alexandrinus ex quo eam Historiam narrat Euseb. more Cæterorum Græcorum, ad suorum temporum Consuetudinem respexit, qua Episcoporum singularis Principatus jam erat introductus. p. 223, 224.

[c] Epistolæ illæ Natæ & suppositæ videntur circa initium aut Medium 2di Seculi, quo tempore primus singularis Episcopatus supra Presbyteratum introductus fuit. p. 253.

[f] Atqui Hæretici illi quos vocas & Trapezitici sænoris Scriptor nunquam Negarunt antiqua etiam tempora discrimen illud inter Episcopos & Presbyteros agnovisse, qui sciunt rem esse antiquissimam ut hi duo Ordines in Ecclesia fuerint Distincti, Episcoporum & Presbyterorum, si excipiantur Apostolica tempora. *Walo Mess. p. 7.*

§. XXX.

SUCH Concessions and many more has *Salmasius* in his *Walo Messalinus*: I say, and many more, particularly one fairly contain'd in the one Testimony produc'd by G. R. [g] from this Book, to prove that *Salmasius* did not acknowledge Episcopacy to have obtain'd in St. *Cyprian's* time. G. R. has transcribed it faithfully enough. And I dare refer it to be determined by any Reader of competent Sense, whether it be not a fair Concession that Episcopacy was introduced about the *Middle* of the *Second Century*.

§. XXXI.

IT were easie to adduce as many plain *Concessions* to our present purpose from *Salmasius's Apparatus ad Libros de Primatu Papæ*. Whoso would see them may turn to the Pages [g] p. 20, 21. on the Margent. [g] As for *Salmasius* his Book *De Presbyteris & Episcopis*, which G. R. names as distinct from his *Walo Messalinus*; I confess my self a stranger to it: I never heard of it before; I never heard any Man say that he had seen 307. & de pri. it. I do not say there's no such Book. 'Tis simply possible that G. R. may have got it Legated to him in Manuscript, 6. 33. 43. 44. by *Salmasius*, as to one who sometime or other might prove so eminent an Advocate for the *Divine Right* of Parity. Only this I am sure of, if there is such a Book, and if Episcopal Government is deny'd in it to have obtain'd in St. *Cyprian's* time, it flatly contradicts the aforesaid *Apparatus* as well as *Walo Messalinus*. But to cut short.

§. XXXII.

TWO other things I shall only desire G. R. hereafter to Remember concerning *Salmasius*. One is that he most plainly

plainly acknowledges even DIOCESAN Episcopacy to have been in St. Cyprian's time. (b) The other, that so soon as (b) *Recitatis* the Two Orders were distinguished, the Bishop had not only a MAJORITY of DIGNITY but also of POWER. *Cornelium salu-* That it was not barely a PRIORITY of ORDER, but *bi Cypriani ver-* a SUPERIORITY of JURISDICTION that did distinguish them: Nay, that (as we have already heard from *blondel*) (i) a PRIMACY of ORDER without a suitable PRIMACY of POWER is not very good Sense, when attributed to Persons of different Orders. (k)

blondel (i) a PRIMACY of ORDER without a suitable PRIMACY of POWER is not very good Sense, when attributed to Persons of different Orders. (k) *blondel* (i) a PRIMACY of ORDER without a suitable PRIMACY of POWER is not very good Sense, when attributed to Persons of different Orders. (k)

(i) *Vide Supra* §. IX. (k) Prima illa Primatus ratio (n. qui Senioritatem sequebatur, quemadmodum supra *Blondellus*; iisdem quippe Principiis nititur hic *Salmasius*) semper servata est quamdiu Apostoli aut eorum Discipuli & Comites Ecclesias rexere. Immo vel usque ad illud tempus quod Notavimus ex Auctore Epistolarum Ignatianarum; Post *Valentinum* nempe *Hæresin*, sub *Pio* & *Marco Antonino*. Non enim illa Apostolica & Antiqua Ecclesie sub Episcopis iisdemque Presbyteris gubernatio cessavit antequam distinctio Nominum simul Munerumque; & proinde etiam Ordinum inter Presbyterum & Episcopum facta est. Tunc enim non Primatus illud propriè fuit quo Episcopus & Presbyter distinctus est, sed, *depo* & *Præfectura*. Primatus quippe tantum datur inter ejusdem Ordinis & Nominis Munerisque Consortes; nec Primatus, siue Primus locus inter pares intelligitur, nisi & Secundus sit & Tertius & Quartus usque ad Ultimum. Ubi Nomina divisa sunt, & Ordo discretus, non est propriè Primatus quo ille qui præest in Ordine superiore, qui subsunt, in inferiore censentur. *ibid.* p. 62.

But does not *Salmasius* say, [*Walo Mess.* Cap. 6.] That the §. XXXIII. Episcopal Jurisdiction did spring partly from the Distinction of the Names, partly from the Indulgence of Christian Princes, and partly from the Ambition of the Popes of Rome? So it is indeed affirm'd (!) Ubi impositus est Episcopus Presbyteris ut Superior, tum æqualitate sublata quæ prius fuerat, ex Superioris gradus eminentia

nata est inferi-
oris Submissio
ac Subjectio
Ordinationis
tum discrimen
interuenit, & ex
Ordinatione Ju
ridictio. Cum
enim jura daretur
et Superiori et
Ordinari Inferiori, tum Superiori in inferiorem, jurisdictio Concessa est. Equum enim
visum est ut non ab alio judicaretur inferior Clericus quam ab eo a quo Ordinabatur.
ACCESSIT & Imperatorum Christianorum Auctoritas ut Constantini & aliorum qui le-
gibus suis Sanxere Clericos a Clericis debere judicari. Sic Jurisdictio Ecclesiastica & Epif-
copalis formata est. QUAM DEINDE promoverunt & auxerunt in Majus, latiusq; ex-
tenderunt Decretis suis Romani Pontifices. *Wal. Mess. Cap. 6. p. 460, 461.*

- §. XXXIV. TO Conclude, it is obvious to any that shall compare
Salmasius's Books with Blondell's Apologia, &c. that those two
Champions have very well understood one another. Their
Schemes are much of a *Piece*: Both affirm *Constant Moderators*
or *Presidents* to have been from the *beginning*: Both make
those *Presidents*, at first, to have been promoted by their
Seniority: Both argue from the *Dichotomy* of the *Clergy*
into *Priests* and *Deacons*: And both agree in fixing much
about the same time, *i. e.* the *middle* of the *second Century*
for the *Introduction* of *Episcopacy*. 'Tis true, they differ some-
times about lesser Matters, or rather, *Salmasius* sometimes
differs from, nay contradicts himself; as even he himself
(m) *Apparat. p. 111.* Confesses. (m) This I take notice of, because perchance
G. R. (when he shall be at the pains to read him) may
find him sometimes talking as if he did not allow Epif-
copacy to have been so early as *St. Cyprian's* time. And,
to tell Truth, sometimes indeed he seems so to Talk.
(n) *p. 112, 210.* particularly in his *Apparatus*. (n) But this can amount to
232, 233. nothing against me; for besides that, his *Concessions* of *Epif-*
copacy's being in *St. Cyprian's* time are much more *numerous*
and *deliberate* than his *Denials*, I may safely say *ten* for
one; what tho' he had but five hundred times denied it, and
had but five times, nay, once, confess'd it? If Authors will
needs contradict themselves, who can help it? In such Cases
indeed G. R's. Rule may take place, *viz.* That contradictory
(o) *Cyp. B. Ex Assertions derogate from the Authority of the Asserter*: (o) But
am. p. 47. §. it can never follow that Citing him for one of the Contra-
36. dictory

dictory Proposition is unfair Dealing: Especially if the Cited Proposition was affirmed last, and after the Proposition of which it is the Contradictory; as it is in the present Case: For in the very last Page (almost the last Words) of his Apparatus, he acknowledges Episcopacy to have prevailed in the second Century. (p) And so I leave him. (p) Constat Episcopatum

quatenus Presbyteratu Major est factus, inventionem esse humanæ Dispositionis, atq; Ecclesiasticæ Consuetudinis, quia ex Divinæ voluntatis præscripto, & ex Apostolica traditione atq; usu Primitivæ Ecclesiæ PER DUO FERME SEcula perpetim servato, Presbyteri iudei fuerunt cum Episcopis, & Communi Consilio singulas Ecclesias quibus præsidebant, Gubernaverunt. Apparatus. p. 307. Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1645.

GO we now to the Provincial Assembly of London, to try §. XXXV. if they have made any such Concession. G. R. says, *he knows not what Book I meant; and that I my self do not know, for what appeareth.* (q) Then he falls a naming Books, viz. (q) §. 13. p. 16. *The Vindication of Presbyterian Government, &c.* And *Jus Divinis Regiminis Ecclesiastici*, and tells no such thing is to be found in them. But is it possible that G. R. has all his Life been a stranger to a Book entituled *Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani*. Printed at London 1654? If he has, then I do tell him there is such a Book, and it has an Appendix added to it, wherein *The Judgment and Practice of Antiquity about the whole Matter of Episcopacy, and especially about the Ordination of Ministers* is (pretended to be) briefly discussed: And I tell him farther that it was that Appendix I meant. For there (r) they put this Question. *How long was it that* (r) p. 104. *the Church of Christ was Govern'd by the common Counsel of Presbyters without a Bishop set over them?* to which they answer thus, Dr. Blondel, a Man of great Learning and Reading, undertakes, in a large Discourse, to make out that before the Year 140 [i. e. more than a full Century before St. Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage] there was not a Bishop set over Presbyters; to whose Elaborate Writings we refer the Reader for farther satisfaction in this particular. In which Words I did, and still do think these two things are clearly contain'd, 1. a fair acknowledgment that Blondel allowed Episcopacy to have been introduced about the Year 140. 2. The Assemblies plain Agreement with Blondel concerning the time of its Introduction. Let G. R. discover my mistake in either of the two, if he can.

§. XXXVI. WOULD G. R. have any more of this Assembly: then let him turn over to p. 119. of the same Appendix, and he will find a certain *Second Proposition* of theirs in these very Words, *That after that Bishops were admitted into the Church, yet notwithstanding, Ordination by Bishops without the assistance of Presbyters was always forbidden and opposed.* And for Proof of this Proposition, he will find them proceeding thus, *Cyprian, in his Exile, writing to his Charge, Certifies them that Aurelius was Ordain'd by him and his Collegues who were present with him. By his Collegues he means his Presbyters, as appears Epist. 5. 8. and Firmilianus saith of them that Rule the Church Quod Baptizandi, manum imponendi & Ordinandi possident Potestatem, and who those be, he expresseth a little before, Seniores & Prepositi by whom the Presbyters as well as Bishops are understood.* Now tho' they do most notably blunder concerning both Authors, as afterwards may be made to appear (v) yet all I take notice of at present, is, That they adduce the Instances of *Cyprian* and his Contemporary, *Firmilian* to prove the aforesaid Proposition, which unavoidably imports an acknowledgment that it was before St. *Cyprian's* time that Bishops were admitted into the Church.

§. XXXVII. BY this time, the impartial Reader may judge whether G. R. had reason to shut up his Accounts of *Chamier*, *Blondel*, *Salmasius*, and the *Provincial Assembly* of London, in these Words, *I shall not hope to say any thing that is convincing, if what I have brought do not persuade the unbiassed Reader that our famous Presbyterians have the same Sentiments of the Judgment of the first Antiquity, about the Power of Presbyters in the Church that I expressed in the place that our Author [J. S.] maketh such a potber about* (r) that is, if it be to the purpose, That they did not acknowledge Episcopacy to have been in the Church before St. *Cyprian's* time.

§. XXXVIII. BUT I did likewise Name *Spanhemius* as acknowledging as much as any of the aforementioned Authors: and here I am whipp'd to purpose. For (i) *G. R. Wonders that I should have brought Spanhem against him. Why? Because the Words I cited amount to no more than a Manifesta negatio which no Presbyterian ever denied to have crept early into the Church.* (u) Had G. R. told us plainly what he meant by *Manifesta negatio*, we had the better understood one another: But I must make the best of it I can. *Negatio* then may signifie, or import Majority of Pow-

er as well as Dignity. And if G. R. will allow that *Spanhem* meant so, I have my asking. But *πρεσβυτρία* is likewise frequently understood by G. R. and his Brethren to signify no more than the Prebeminence of a Presbyterian Moderator, who *sits in Parity* with the rest of the Presbytery; And if it is in this Sense that G. R. here takes it, I will take the Liberty to wonder as much at him as he does at me. And 1. I wonder how he came to say that such *πρεσβυτρία* CREPT EARLY into the Church. How can that be said to have CREPT EARLY into the Church, which was always in the Church? which was as EARLY as there was a Church? which (as is confessed by all Presbyterians, G. R. himself not excepted) was in the Apostles times, Coeval with the very first Presbytery (v) And 2. I wonder with what Assurance G. R. can affirm that this was all the *πρεσβυτρία* that was meant by *Spanhemius*; and that for two Reasons. 1. Because it is plain that *Spanhem* called it *Manifesta πρεσβυτρία* upon the account of the bright Evidence there is for Episcopal Prebeminence in the Third Century, beyond what there was for it in the Second. This, I say, is plain to any Person who shall compare the account he gives of the state of the Government of the Church in the Second Century, with his account which I cited concerning the Third. Accounting for the Second, he tells that there were no other Ecclesiastical Orders known in that Age but those of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, and he insinuates a doubt concerning Bishops and Presbyters, whether they were really or only nominally distinguished. (w) But when he comes to the Third, he says, in the Words cited by me, that Bishops had a MANIFEST PREHEMINENCE. This to me seems Demonstration that he was not so much as thinking upon the simple Prebeminence or *πρεσβυτρία* of a Presbyterian Moderator. But this is not all, For 2. he sufficiently explains what *πρεσβυτρία* he meant, by the Words immediately added for Explanation, which I did likewise subjoin. He says *Manifesta πρεσβυτρία seu jure Præsidentis, Convocandi, Ordinandi, &c.* Now by the Presbyterian Principles, the *jus Præsidentis*, the Right of presiding is all that is Essential to a Presbyterian Moderator: For a Presbyterian Moderator, as such has not the *jus Convocandi*, the Power of Convocating, neither has he the *jus Ordinandi*, the Power of Ordaining. And, according to G. R's Philosophy, whereby all &c's must have vast Bellies, who

(v) Vide Supra S. V.

(w) Ordines Ecclesiasticos haud notas alios hac ætate--- præter Episcopos Presbyteros (seu tam Nominibus seu reipsa Distinctos) & Diaconos. Secul. 2. Sect. 5. S. 2. p. 70.

who can tell what other Rights or Powers, Spanhem lodg'd in the vast Belly of his, &c? And so much for G. R.'s first Blow.

§. XXXIX. 2. G. R. says I dealt not fairly with that Learned writer. Why so? I Curtail'd his Words leaving out what displeased me. Well! which were the Words that so much displeased me as to move me to leave them out? These, *Quonquam de Episcopis Controversam diversam an* (my Book has *ac*, which is certainly Right) *Superioris Ordinis haberentur*: that is, *Tbo' it be a Controversie whether Bishops were of a different and a Superior Order*. Now I would gladly know who told G. R. that it was Displeasure that made me leave out these Words? who so said so to him has so abused him as he ought to consider before he trust them again: For I do assure him they did not displease me. And why should they have done it? Blessed be God, as much a School Boy as I am, I was not so Childish as to imagine that Spanhem meant that it was a Controversie in St. Cyprian's time, whether Bishops and Presbyters were of the same, or of Different Orders. And why should it have displeased me that Spanhem should have said that now adays, it is a Controversie? Why, I say, should his Narrating such an uncontroverted Matter of Fact have created me the least Grain of Displeasure? I know perfectly well, there is such a Controversie. I know it has been a Controversie these very many Years: A Controversie which has been warmly debated between Prelatists and Presbyterians, almost ever since the fatal Controversies concerning Church Government came to be warmly debated; nay, a Controversie about which there has been no little tugging even among those who have been frank enough for Prelacy; a Controversie ever since Peter Lombard's time amongst the Popish Writers: And a Controversie even among the Reformed Prelatists. For how many such have been who have maintained that Bishops and Presbyters do not make different Orders, but only different Degrees of one and the same Order? Why then did I leave out these Words of Spanhem's? for this very good Reason; the purpose I was pursuing was no more concern'd in them than in the Iliads of Homer or the Odes of Horace. My purpose was to shew that Spanhem had acknowledged there was Episcopacy in St. Cyprian's time. And let G. R. when he has Leisure, tell me what or how much this purpose was concern'd in the Modern Controversie, whether

The same Spanhem in his Ep. Respons. ad Amicis de nupera prefatione Joannes Vander Waayen p. 47. thus Episcoporum inter Britannos nominati gradui, Dignitati saltem ALTERO post nati Christum SECULO, in Ecclesia Surgenti; &c. plainly ascribing its Introduction to the second Century. And all that Vander Waayen (tho' an Ingrain'd Presbyterian (which Spanhem is not) has Courage to say is, Neque tempore Apostolorum, nec seculo primo, nec initio Secundi ullibi fuit istius modi Episcopatus qualis in Anglia nunc obtinet. Vide Ep. Apostologer. P. 327.

ther Bishops and Presbyters make two Orders or only two Degrees of one and the same Order? But the last Charge is heaviest, For

3. G. R. says I have dealt *unchristianly* with Spanhem. I shall be sorry if I have. I do not love to deal *unchristianly* by any Man. But where lies this *unchristian* Dealing? In two things 1. in *Detracting* from his Knowledge of *Antiquity*. As if, forsooth, Spanhem were such an infallible Master at *Antiquity*, as that no Man can pretend to have catch'd him Tripping in any point of it, without dealing *unchristianly* with him. For my part, I think it no more *Heresie* to deny *Dutch* than *Italian* *Infallibilities*: And I think my self the more Innocent as to Spanhem, that I have irrefragably proved his *Mistake*, so very irrefragably, that I am not afraid that either Spanhem or G. R. shall ever be able to Answer my Arguments. But

2. I HAVE misrepresented his Words out of which I endeavour'd to make good my Charge. Wherein? in saying that Spanhem denieth Exorcists to have been in the Third Century; whereas he doth not mention Exorcists in that place, but only Ostiarios, Copiatas, Acolythos. G. R. so far as I can Guard against it, shall never have occasion to say that I deal unfairly with him; And therefore I will not say that he is altogether Inexcusable in this. For, perhaps he had only seen the first Edition of Spanhem's *Epitome Isagogica ad Historiam Eccl. N. T.* which, as I remember, was Printed Anno 1675. In which Edition there is indeed no mention of Exorcists. But then the same Spanhem did again publish the same Book with Enlargements and some Alterations 1689. with a notable as well as new Dedication which you have Word for Word on the Margent (*) and it was from this latter Edition that I Transcribed these Words. *Sed nec business Ordines Minores quales Ostiariorum, Copiatorum, Acolythorum, Exorcistarum.* If G. R. shall blame me for Citing from the Second Edition of a Book, which had the Authors Second Care, and by Consequence is to be supposed to contain his riper and better pondered Sentiments, I shall bear it as well as I can. But if Exorcistarum be not as really there as Ostiariorum, Copiatorum, Acolythorum, I am content that G. R. sacrifice my Name to perpetual Infamy. But then as I do not reckon G. R. altogether Inexcusable in this Matter, so neither can I allow it to be altogether Excusable in him, to have so rashly passed such an uncharitable Sentence on me, viz.

§. XL.

XIXXX

§. XLI.

(x) Sereñissimo potentissimoq; Principi ac Domino D. Guiljelmo D. G. Mag. nre Britannie, Francie, Hibernieq; Regi, Fidei Defensori. Pio, Clementi, Magnanimo, Federatæ Belgicæ supremo Gubernatori, Oppressâ Europæ Liberatori That as Vindici, Re-

ni generis; hæc
iplo Regiæ un-
ctionis & Con-
secrationis die,
voto Nuncupa-
bat Fredericus
Spanhemius.

That I had dealt *unchristianly* by Spanhem, when so very easie an Enquiry, as it is to try if there be any *Second Editions* of a Book, might have convinced him, that I had done Spanhem nothing but *Justice*. I wish this may be a Caution to him for the future.

§. XLII.

PROCEED we now to try if any more Presbyterian Authors can be found who have made the like *Concessions*. I ask the Readers allowance to take some pains this way. I am in a manner forced to do it for mine own Vindication; for having named *Chamier, Blondel, Salmasius*, and the *Provincial Assembly of London*, I added an *&c.* And G. R. tells me, *he knows not what my, &c. may contain in its vast Belly.* (y) I shall not enter into the Philosophy of this profound Question, whether it be *Essential* to all *&c's.* to have VAST BEL-LIES? Tho', if it is not, I cannot see a Reason why G. R. should have given a *vast Belly* to my *&c.* for it was an *&c.* of my own making, and might not I have made its *Belly* as *lank* as I pleased? But to the purpose: Let G. R. take the following Authors, who may for once satisfy *&c's.* Appetite if it is not an *arrant Glutton.* And

§. XLIII.

1. LET him take JOHN CALVIN himself, whom I know, he is earnest to have a *Presbyterian*. This great Author fairly allows *proper Prelats*, that is, *Bishops* with *Imparity of Power* as well as *Dignity*; *Bishops* as far above *Presbyters* as the *Roman Consuls* were above the *Common Senators*, to have been in the Church ever since *St. Mark's* time (x) so he understands *Jerom* and Subscribes to him (a) And he frequently allows *St. Cyprian* to have been a *Bishop* (b) Nay he allows of *Metro-politans* in *St. Cyprian's* time, with *POWER* over other *Bi-byteros*: Illi ex *shops* (c) And besides these *Concessions* which he has in the *Fourth Book* of his excellent *Institutions*, he has a most remarkable Passage to this purpose, in his notable Discourse concerning the *necessity of Reforming the Church*; for having most heartily insisted on, and recommended the Constitution of the Ecclesiastical Government as it was in *St. Cyprian's* time, he immediately subjoins to this purpose, *That if the Church, in his time, would agree to such an Episcopacy; no Curses could be imagined, which he should not think those worthy of, who should not submit to it, with all Reverence and dutiful Obedience.* (d)

(x) Quibus Do-
cendi munus
injunctum erat,
eos omnes No-
minabant Pres-
bypteros: Illi ex
suo Numero, in
singulis Civita-
tibus unum eli-
gebant, cui spe-
cialiter dabant
Titulum Epif-
copi, ne ex æ-
QUALITATE
ut fieri solet dis-
fidia Nasceren-
tur: Neq; ta-
men sic Monore

& Dignitate Superior erat Episcopus, ut Dominium in Collegas haberet; sed quas partes habet Consul in Senatu, ut Referat de Negotiis, Sententias roget, Consulendo, Monendo, Herando, aliis præeat, auctoritate sua totam Actionem regat, & quod Decretum Communi Consilio fuerit, exequatur, id muneris sustinebat in Presbyterorum Cætu. Atque id ipsum pro temporum necessitate fuisse HUMANO CONSENSU introductum fatentur ipsi veteres (NB. HUMANO CONSENSU, &c. Hæc enim verba (ipso Calvino teste, ut supra Notatur §. V.) Episcopum illum de quo loquitur, Merum Presbyterii Moderatorem fuisse non patiuntur.) Hæc. Calv. Inst. Lib. 4. Cap. 4. §. 2.

(u) Alibi tamen docet Hieronymus quam fuerit antiquum institutum: Dicit enim Alexandria a Marco Evangelista usq; ad Heraclam & Dionysium, Presbyteros semper unum ex se Electum in Excelliori gradu Collocasse quem Episcopum Nominabant, &c. *ibid.*

(b) Vide Lib. 4. Instit. Cap. 7. §. 3. 21. 30. Cap. 10. §. 18. Cap. 11. §. 4. 6. Cap. 12. §. 6.

(c) Agnoscit enim Romanum Episcopum Stephanum Cypriani Contemporaneum. adversus eos qui suæ provinciæ essent Episcopos Jurisdictione præditum fuisse. Instit. Lib. 4. Cap. 7. §. 7.

(d) Talem nobis Hierarchiam si exhibeant, in qua sic emineant Episcopi ut Christo subesse non recusent, ut ab illo tanquam unico Capite pendeant, & ad ipsum referantur; in qua sic inter se Fraternali Societatem colant, ut non alio nodo quam ejus veritate sint Colligati, tum vero nullo non Anathemate dignos fatear, si qui erunt qui non eam Reverentur summæque obedientiæ observent. De Neceff. Ref. Eccl. Genev. 1576. p. 100.

2. BEZA distinguishes three sorts of Episcopacy; The Divine, §. XLIV. the Human and the Satanical. The Human he defines to be that which from meer Human Prudence, and without warrant from the Word of God, was introduced into the Church, whereby a Power was given to one Pastor above his Collegues, yet bounded with Canons for avoiding Tyranny. (e) So that this Human Bishop is quite another thing than a Presbyterian Moderator; for such (as has been already observ'd, §. V.) He makes altogether necessary to the very Being of a Presbytery. Now, this Human Bishop he, in most express terms, allows to have been in the Church, in Ignatius's time, that is, near to a Century and an half before St. Cyprian. (f)

Potestas quædam uni cuidam pastori supra suos Collegas attributa, Canonibus tamen certis seu Regulis adversus Tyrannidem definita. Inter Sarraviæ Opp. De Tripl. Episcopatu p. 14.

(f) Concludimus Episcopatum humanum non ORDINIS sed SUPERIORITATIS (nota quam diserte distinguat Episcopatum hunc inter & munus meri Moderatoris) humanitus fuisse introductum — suntq; de hoc Episcopatu accipienda quæcunq; nondum in Ecclesia Satanico Episcopatu, de Episcoporum sive *ἐπισκόπων* (ut loquitur Justinus) auctoritate apud Ignatium & alios Vetustiores Scriptores habentur. *Ibid.* p. 45.

3. ANTONIUS SADEEL another famous Presbyterian in §. XLV. his Answer to the Repeated Sophisms of Francis Turrian the Jesuit, Concerning the Church and the Ordinations of Ministers

nisters (as well as *Beza*) more than once acknowledges *E-*
 (g) in *Epistola* piscopacy to have been before *St. Cyprian* (g) nay even in the
 (*Cypriani*, n.) Days of *Ignatius*. (b)
 ad *Antonianum*

quam mihi objicis, nihil dicit *Cyprianus* quod te juvat, cum enim ex **VETERI INSTITU-**
TO eoq; **HUMANO** unius Ecclesiæ unum esse *Episcopum* oporteret, *Cyprianus* ait per-
 peram facere *Novitianum* Schismaticum quod *Episcopatum Romanum* ambiret, &c. parte
 prima p. 445. Edit. *Morgii An.* 1583. Et *ibid.* p. 507. illic enim (n, de unitate Ec-
 clesiæ) *Cyprianus* Schismaticos ac præsertim *Novatianum* perstringens, negat in uno loco
 posse esse vel plures *Greges* vel plures *Pastores*, adeo ut *Damnandi* essent Schismatici qui
 Ecclesias dividebant, & in iis Ecclesiis quæ suum habebant *Episcopum* **EX ORDINE**
TUM RECEPTO Constitutum, ipsi *Episcopatum* usurpabant. Et parte secunda p. 137.
 De *Presbyteris Romanis* *Novatianum* deferentibus, &c. *Hec habet.* Illic igitur describit
Cyprianus eorum *Resipiscentiam* qui a Schismate ad Ecclesiam redierant, quum agnosce-
 rent unum *Episcopum* in Ecclesia esse debere, ac propterea se *Pseudo-Episcopo* renunciare.
 Hoc autem **VETUS** quidem fuit, at **HUMANUM INSTITUTUM** in remedium Schif-
 matis inventum ut testatur *Hieronymus*.

(b) Vide partem secundam p. 448.

§. XLVI.

FRANCISCUS JUNIUS in his *Animadversions* on *Bellar-*
 Not. 24. *Hæc min*, *Contr.* 5. *Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 14. Not. 24. is every whit as *Frank*,
Tertullianus de for *Bellarmin* having adduced the Testimonies of *Ignatius*,
Modo Ordinis *Irenæus*, *Tertullian* (particularly Citing the famous Testimony
 Ecclesiastici *Dandi quidem jus habet summus Sacerdos*, &c. from *Tertullian's*
 pro ratione sui *Book* about *Baptism*, *Cap.* 17.) *Junius* Answers that *Tertullian*
 temporis enun- *is to be understood as speaking agreeably to the Order received*
 ciat; nam *Di-* *in his time; That Human Ordinance of Bishops above Presbyters*
 vine instituti- *being then in use: And the same Bellarmin* having adduced the
 oni jam diu per *same Testimonies* again, to prove that of old a *Bishop* was more
 illud tempus or- *than a Roman Consul*, &c. *Junius* (Not. 25.) returns the same
 do ille *Hum-*
 nis accefferat. *Answer.*
 Et Not. 25. ne-
 gamus hoc fe-

qui ex loco *Pauli*——*Alii loco* (n, ex *Irenæo*, *Tertulliano*, &c. Citati) ex humano in-
 stitutions & observatione loquuntur; quæ tum obtinebat.

§. XLVII.

4. **THE CENTURIATORS** of **MAGDEBURG** are as
 plain in their acknowledgments as any Men; 'Tis need-
 less to insist on their *Concessions* concerning the *Third Cen-*
tury. They give enough in the *Second*. They not only tell
 us that *The three Orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons did,*
then, every where prevail, But likewise, in most plain terms,
 they say, *That it was in this, Second, Century, That the*
Change of Government was made, and that by Humane Authority,
Episcopacy was introduced. (i)

(i) Circa hæc
 tempora eam in

Ecclesia Mutationem cepisse & Episcopatum non tam Divina institutione, quam humana auctoritate, propter bonum Ordinem & edificationem atq; Successionem, GRADU PRESBYTERIO SUPERIOREM haberi. *Cent. 2. Cap. 7. Col. mihi 126.*

6. GERSOMUS BUCERUS a first rate Advocate for Pres- §. XLVIII.
byterian Government, has more than 20 times given his
Concessions. You have a few of them on the Margent (k) (k) *Episcop. 29.*
from his large Book *De Gubernatione Ecclesiae.* p. 173. *Testi-*
monis, quibus-

dam, ex Sancti Cypriani Epistolis. Citatis, ita Subnectit. Unde Colligimus (inquit) quomodo Presbyteri in Ecclesiae Gubernatione sine Episcopi Auctoritate nihil agere poterant, &c. Vide plura huc Spectantia, Episcop. 78. p. 305. Et p. 311. Tagnosce Mutationem factam, post primum omniumq; purissimum Charitativum seculum. Et p. 315. in amplioribus Ecclesiis, Episcopalis *negotia* actio decursusq; Apostolorum Evo cepit. Et p. 327. venio ad tertium seculum in quo Episcopi cum in PRESBYTERIUM tum in DIOECESIN MAJORI POTESTATE Ceperunt uti. Et p. 343. Loquuntur; patres non de Melioris temporis primo & antiquissimo Seculo — Sed partim de Secundo partim de Tertio Seculo loquuntur, postquam Episcopi Humano jure praesuerunt; aut etiam (ut in tertio seculo factum) ex auctoritate, cum in PRESBYTERIUM, tum in DIOECESIN totam, PLUS POTESTATIS adepti sunt. Et p. 344. Cedō num aliquis senserit Presbyteris Baptismi administrationem ex Domini institutione & Apostolicae aetatis usu illicitam fuisse? attamen postea, nisi Episcopi Auctoritas accederet, Consuetudine illicitam evadere cepisse Tertullianus mihi Auctor, Dandi inquit Baptismum habet jus summus Sacerdos, &c. Bucero igitur palam agnoscente, Tertulliani auctoritate, Episcopatus cui non solum Major Dignitas sed & Potestas annexa, floruit.

7. PETRUS MOLINÆUS in his Letters to the Learn- §. XLIX.
ed Bishop Andrews, doth more than once confess that it
was introduced if not in yet very shortly after the Days
of the Apostles. (l) nay,

(l) Scripti libri De vocatione Pastorum
in quo quædam sapientissimi Regis [Jacobi] animum pupugerunt, quasi adversa Muneri Episcopali. Sed Altrinfecus quidem Nostrates non obscure conqueruntur me Episcoporum Causam egisse, Aeriumq; damnasse, quod in re pridem & ubiq; recepta ausus sit opponere sese Consensui Universalis Ecclesiae; Molesteq; ferunt me dixisse, jam inde a proximis Successoribus Apostolorum passim receptum fuisse in Ecclesia ut inter Presbyteros unius urbis unus aliquis Eminentet & Episcopus vocaretur. Epist. 1. inter Episcopi Wintoniensis Opuscula quædam posthuma, Edit. Lond. 1629. p. 161, 162. Et Epist. 2. ibid. p. 173. Non sum tam fastidiose arrogans ut velim me opponere toti antiquitati; & rem quæ jam inde a Seculo Apostolis Proximo recepta fuit in Ecclesia, ut vitiosam aut improbam aspernari. Et Epist. 3. p. 179. se, in Libro suo, De muneri Pastoralis, p. 20, 21. in hunc modum ait Scripsisse. Statim post tempora Apostolorum, aut etiam eorum tempore, ut testatur Historia Ecclesiastica, Constitutum est ut in una urbe unus inter Ceteros Presbyteros Episcopus Vocaretur, qui in suos Collegas haberet Præminentiam, ad vitandam Confusionem quæ ex ÆQUALITATE nascitur. Et p. 180. nec sum usq; adeo Oris Duri ut velim adversus illa Veteris Ecclesiae lumina, Ignatium, Polycarpum, Cyprianum, Augustinum, Chrysostomum, Basilium, Gregorium Nyssenum, &c. Episcopos

ferre Sententiam, ut adversus homines vitio Creatos, aut usurpatores Muneris illiciti. Nonne hic Ignatium, Polycarpum, Cyprianum; ejusdem Speciei cum Augustino, Chrysostomo, &c. Episcopos fuisse Concedit? Immo vero p. 184. agnoscit Dignitatem Episcopalem ab ipsis Ecclesiæ incunabulis deduci posse.

§. L.

8. PAUL BAYNES himself, one of G. R's. *singular* Men in his *Diocesans Trial*, is forced to acknowledge that there was *Episcopacy* in St. Cyprian's time, in the Person of Cornelius Bishop of Rome, p. 20. See more 45. & 63. Nay before St. Cyprian's time, in the Church of Alexandria. p. 44. I say he is forced, for indeed he does it most unwillingly: And

§. LI.

(m) p. 18, 19.

(n) p. 20.

(o) p. 21.

(p) p. 37.

§. LII.

(q) inter pastores fuerunt etiam quidam Gradus: Nam

9. Mr. PEREGRIN his other *singular* Man, tells us in his *Letters Patents*, &c. That in the Age after the Apostles Custom had brought in a kind of *Diocesan Bishops*, to preside in Synods, tho' in other respects they were reckoned amongst other Presbyters till about the Year 195. (i. e. at least 50 Years before St. Cyprian was a Clergyman) that Victor gave it higher Advances. (m) Indeed, he so far owns it to have been in St. Cyprian's time, that he most singularly cites Cyprian Representing the Growth of *Episcopacy* as a main cause of the wrath of God which appeared in the Decian Persecution. (n) Nay these are his very Words (o) Thus while *Diocesan Bishops* were Ordained to withstand Divisions, on the contrary, they were increased thereby, as appeareth by the Reasons which CYPRIAN & EUSEBIUS give of the Persecutions, and others about the Feast of Easter. Once more, endeavouring to shew how it was nothing strange that in the Primitive times, *Episcopacy* was not Condemn'd; Nay, that they were condemn'd as Hereticks who opposed it, he says, That the hurt and wrong that Bishops do to Christ's Kingdom could not be so evident in the time of Cyprian and Athanasius, as it was since, or now is; even as the Lion or Leopard doth but little harm, while it is but a little VVhelp. (p) These two singular Authors I have cited out of pure Reverence to G. R's. Recommendation. I return now to Men of some more Sense. In the next place, then,

10. JOANNES HEN. ALSTEDIUS in his Supplement to Chamier's *Panstratia*, allows Titus to have been Bishop of Crete, and the Seven *Apocalyptick Angels* to have been *singular Persons*, and in a proper Sense, Bishops (q) Nay, that Imparity got footing instantly after the Decease of the Apostles, or rather in the times of the Apostles, and by their Appointment. (r) And

And yet this Author had Zeal enough for Prebyterian ^{alii alii fuerunt} Government. ^{Superiores. v.g.}

^{Titus fuit Episcopus Cretæ, a-}

deoq; aliis Episcopis Præpositus. Et Episcopi Septem Ecclesiarum in Apocalypsi, suos proculdubio SUB SE habuerunt Episcopos: patet itaq; hos Ordines admisisse suos gradus. *Tom. 5. Lib. 4. Cap. 1. Edit. 1629.*

(r) Sed quia inter Presbyteros alii alii præfuerunt, ira nimirum ut in quolibet Collegio unus aliquis Primarius Presbyter, sive Episcopus, sive Pastor, nempe Ordinis & Regiminiis Causa fuerit Constitutus; Certum nobis esse debet, Statim post Apostolorum excessum cæpisse discrimen istud inter Episcopum & Presbyterum: Discrimen dico non Essentiale sed accidentale: nam Episcopus dicebatur qui Presbyteris pluribus præerat. Quid? Res ipsa Cæpit tempore Apostolorum vel ab ipsis profecta est Apostolis: Nam Paulus mandans Tito ut oppidatim Presbyteros Constituat, ipsi quandam *ἐκκλησίαν* super ipsos delegat. *ib. §. 14.*

II. ANDREAS RIVETUS does also frankly acknowledge §. LIII. Episcopacy to have been in the Days not only of Tertullian (s) but also of Ignatius. (t) i. e. long before St. ^{(s) Argumento} Cyprian. ^{a Celebri illo}

^{Tertulliani, testimonio, Dandi jus habet, &c. deducto, Respondens, hæc habet. Tertullianus de HUMANO ORDINE jam suo tempore recepto loquitur, quo, ex omnibus unus Ecclesiæ Episcopis, probatus quisque Senior, ut loquitur, in Collegii presidem eligebatur quem Episcopum Specialiter appellabant. Cathol. Orth. Tract. 2. Quest. 22. §. 3.}

(t) De Ignatio, Quod autem Presbyteros Subjicit Episcopis, sic intelligimus, non quod ii qui laborabant in Doctrina, & duplici Honore digni erant, cum Episcopis eundem Ordinem non Constituerint sed quod JAM TUM MOS ILLE INVALESCERET ut inter Presbyteros unus Electus esset qui cæteris anteiret. *ibid. §. 4.*

12. SMECTYMNUUS, to avoid needless Controversie, §. LIV. lays down three things as acknowledged. 1. That the first and best Antiquity used the names of Bishops and Presbyters promiscuously. 2. That in process of time some one was Honoured with the Name of Bishop, and the rest were called Presbyters or Cleri. 3. That this was not NOMEN INANE but there was some kind of Imparity between him and the rest of the Presbyters. (u) Now is it not certain that before St. Cyprian's time, ^{(u) p. 21. Edit. 1654.} the Names were Impropriated?

Again, Do not these five Gentlemen Subscribe to Jerom's Opinion about the Introduction of Imparity? (v) And doth ^{(v) p. 24.} not he make it to have obtain'd in Alexandria ever since St. Mark's time? Farther yet, Do not they Reason for the Original Identity of Bishops and Presbyters from this Topick, That they do not find in Scripture any Ordination to the Office of a Bishop, differing from the Ordination of an Elder? ^(w)

(w) p. 18.

(w) And will it not follow by Parity of Reason that so soon as there were different Ordinations, there were different Offices? Now to imagine that they did not know that there were distinct Ordinations for Bishops and Presbyters in St. Cyprian's time, were to have but a very mean Opinion of the Learning of *Smeethymnus*. Once more, How often do they Cite him for a Pattern to Bishops? (x) Lastly, are they not forced, for finding a Difference between the Bishops of the Cyprianic Age, and the English Bishops, when they wrote, to have recourse to the sorry Plea of the SOLE POWER, and affirm, that the Ancient Bishops did not (as the English) Claim the SOLE POWER of Ordination and Jurisdiction?

(x) See Page 18. 27. 29. 31. 32. 35. & Vindication p. 10.

(y) Vide §. 8. & 9. §. LV.

(z) §. II. & III.

13. THE PUBLISHERS of the English Annotations in their Advertisement concerning the Notes on Phil. i. 1. and 1 Tim. 3. 1. and 1 Tim. 5. 17. tell us, that Bishops were set over Presbyters by a Custom, which tho' very Ancient, and near the Apostles times, as Chamier truly acknowledgeth, hath for a long time far departed from the Golden Rule, the Word of God. Here you see Chamier's acknowledgment concerning the early Introduction of Episcopacy (which you have above (x) is very frankly approved. Again, in that same Advertisement, whereas the Annotator on Phil. i. 1. had Cited the Council of Nice, for this, that there should be but one Bishop in a City, and Cornelius Reproaching Novatianus with the Ignorance of such a Common Principle in the Ecclesiastical Government, the Adversaries observe as follows. As to the Council of Nice, (they after a good deal of Trifling tell us) If there was an express Canon to that purpose, it was so much younger than the Antiquity alledged for the PARITY or rather the IDENTITY of Bishops and Presbyters, that as to the Point in Question, rightly stated, it makes nothing for the Prelatic Prebeminence. From which it is plain that they do not only acknowledge a Prelacy to have been in the Church in the time of the Council of Nice. But also that that Council (which yet they reckon, tho' falsely, to have been An. 314.) was very far Posterior to all the Evidences, they could pretend to adduce for PARITY. This I take notice of because it is so clearly inconsistent with the Accounts our Scottish Presbyterians have given of the Novelty of Episcopacy (a) But that which is most directly to our present purpose is, what they say concerning Cornelius and

(a) Vide Supra Cap. I. §. IX. & c.

and Novatianus; their Words are, *And if, Cornelius a better Man than his Ambitious and Fraudulent Antagonist (for Novatianus was both) spake big Words to uphold the PRELACY he stood for (it being in his own Case, and in so hot a Contestation) it is no Matter either of Marvel or of Moment to Maintain the PRELACY of Bishops either as agreeable to the Word of God, or the most pure and Primitive Antiquity, since Cornelius was Contemporary with Cyprian in the Third Century, &c.* Now all I am concern'd for at present is (not to call them to an account for giving such harsh Treatment to such a Holy Martyr as *Cornelius*, but) that I dare affirm, we have here a fair Concession of Episcopacy in St. Cyprian's time.

14. THE DIVINES at NEW-PORT in the Isle of §. LVI.

WIGHT (Mr. Marshal, the first of the Five of which Smectymnus was compounded, M. Vines, M. Carol and M. Seaman, if we may believe the Synod of London in their Vindication of Presbyterian Government p. 125.) who disputed with King Charles the First, in their first Paper given in to his Majesty, do make their Concession thus [*We grant that not long after the Apostles times, Bishops in SOME SUPERIORITY to (Ergo not in PARITY with) Presbyters are by the Writers of these times reported to have been in the Church.*

That is, as they explain themselves in their Second Paper (b) while the Function was one, the Names were not Divided; when the Function was Divided, the Name was divided also, and indeed Improprate: Which as I have often said, no Man can deny to have been done before St. Cyprian's time. In short, those Divines express their Minds in the very Terms of their Master Salmasius, and so no doubt, according to his Meaning; whereof we have had enough already. (c)

(b) p. 223. E. dict. Hague. 1651.

15. LUDOVICUS CAPELLUS in his Theological Positions §. LVII.

concerning the Difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter (d) acknowledges this Difference to have been made in the Second Century; and it is observable that he attempts to prove it by the Epistles of Ignatius, which (tho' he will needs have them to be spurious, yet) he allows to have been extant in the Days of Irenæus, who, for any thing G. R. can know to the contrary, was dead before St. Cyprian was Born. (e) Indeed it was no wonder that he ascribed the Introduction of Episcopacy to the Second Cen-

(c) Supra §.

(d) Tho. Salm. part. 3. Disp. 22. §. 16. Decedente primo Collegii Presbytero, qui secundus erat in Collegio illi succedebat, & 2do Tertius, Tertio Quartus

ficque Reliqui tury, considering that he owns *Blondel* and *Salmasius* for pro Ordine Co- his Masters in this Controversie. (f)
 optationis suæ
 in Collegio. At-

que hæc succedendi Ratio manet in Ecclesia ad finem usq; ferme Secundi a Christo Nato Seculi, quo tempore ratio illa succedendi in Munere, & Regendi Ecclesiam immutata fuit. Tum enim Primus Collegii factus est per reliquorum Presbyterorum Electionem, & mox paulatim Concessa est illi aliqua supra reliquos Sympresbyteros POTESTAS Hæc. §. 16.

(e) Nova enim illa institutio (*νεωτερον τεστις*, ab hac enim Phrasi ab Ignatio usurpata argumentum ducit quo probet *Napieram* fuisse unius supra Cæteros pralationem; quam solide alias fortassis dispiciendum) non est istuc accipienda de solo Episcopi Nomine quod tum demum Caperit tribui illi qui Presbyteris præponebatur, sed de GRADU & POTESTATE quam PRÆ illis & SUPRA eos per novellam illam institutionem habebat. § 22. & paucis interjectis, Hac habet § 24. Ita fit manifestum Novum Ordinem de Presbyterorum in Præmi locum successionem ab Apostolico Diversum, Novamq; Constitutionem de Episcopi in Presbyteros prærogativa & Auctoritate factam esse, ut ex illo Auctoris istius (n. Ignatii) testimonio constat post Centesimum quinquagesimum a Christi Resurrectione & Spiritus Sancti Missionem in Apostolos annum, Circa Irenæi tempora

(f) Vide Initium. Disputationis.

§. LVIII.

16. MOYSES AMIRALDUS Capellus's Collegue proceeds upon the very same, (that is *Blondel's*) Principles, as is clear from *Tb. Salm. Part. 3. Disput. 38. §. 10. 14, 15, 19.* so that he may be reckoned another Presbyterian (for that he was Zealous enough) who acknowledges Episcopacy to have prevail'd in the Days of St. Cyprian. So may also

§. LIX.

17. ALBERTINUS, *Blondel's* Collegue, who therefore reckons *Ignatius's* Epistles Spurious, because so pat for Episcopal Government: And yet withal he makes them to have been forged about the middle of the Second Century, and to have been (unwarily and without Examination)

(g) Circa Medium 2di seculi compositæ sunt, ac incaute & absq; examine a veteribus Receptæ. Reason he affirm'd so, is not the Matter: It is enough, that he fairly confesses Episcopacy to have obtain'd in the Second Century.

Albertinus De Eucharistia p. 284. as cited by Dr. Hammond against Dr. Owen Cap. 2. Sect. 1. N. 16.

§. LX.

18. SAMUEL BOCHARTUS in his famous Epistle to Dr. Morley, tho' he affirms that Presbyters were before Bishops,

shops, yet is very Confident that Episcopacy was introduced very soon after the Apostles. (b)

(b) si de antiquitate res est, cum Hieronymo plane sentio.

rio, Apostolorum ætate, inter Episcopos & Presbyteros nihil fuisse Discriminis, & Communi Presbyterorum Consilio Ecclesias fuisse administratas: Itaque Presbyteri Episcopis omnino sunt Antiquiores. Interim, Episcopale Regimen esse Antiquissimum, & Paulo post. Apostolos per universam Ecclesiam magno cum fructu obtinuisse, est mihi Compertissimum, Pag. mihi 7.

19. JOANNES HOORNBECK another faithful follower §. LXI. of Blondel and Salmasius, in his Dissertation concerning Episcopacy, more than once, expressly owns it to have been in St. Cyprian's time. Particularly, he says, after that Bishops were become Superiour to Presbyters, by having some POWER over them, and the Exercise of some Ecclesiastical Acts appropriated to them, yet it was not allowed them to deprive Presbyters of all Power of Government. (i) And having for this cited divers Testimonies from St. Cyprian (k) he concludes thus, so that it is plain (says he) that even after the Difference and disparity between Bishops and Presbyters was introduced, wise and Holy Bishops did not intirely exclude Presbyters from all interest in the Government (l) indeed he has many such Concessions, as may be learned from the Margent. (m)

(i) denique quamvis jam etiam POTESTATE aliqua sed Ecclesiastica, & Actuum quorundam Ecclesiasticorum exercitio Superiores Presbyteri

ris essent Episcopi, attamen monebantur quoque ut ne Presbyteros a Regimine Ecclesiæ removerent, quod neque fecerunt optimi quique. p. 36. Dein multis Cypriani Testimoniis, per paginas 37, 38, 39. aspersis, tandem p. 39. Sic Concludit. Ita vel post Constitutum in Ecclesia Discrimen & Disparem inter Episcopum ac Presbyteros Gradum, non tamen sanioris ac sanctioris animi Episcopi omnia ad se rapiebant & Presbyteros excludebant, &c.

(m) Quousque in Primitiva Ecclesia simplicissimus Ordo vixit, ut pro ætate & tempore adeptæ Ordinationis, Priores Ecclesiæ in Collegarum & Compresbyterorum seu Coepiscoporum Collegæ Moderaretur, & huic Decedenti sequens surrogaretur, isti iterum Proximus, & sic deinceps, & ille quasi Primatus Ordinis, uti dicunt, haberetur, nullo cujuspiam ambitu, sed successione Naturali, quod durasse autumat Salmasius circa Medium 2di Seculi, Blondellus ad Annum 136. in Ecclesia Hierosolymitana; & in Romana ad annum haud multum discrepantem 140. Neq; Nominis neq; Ordinis aut Superioris Potestatis ulla fuit inter Ecclesiæ Præpositos, differentia: sed ubi Ratio illa succedendi vetus in ægyptiaca, si qua & qualiscunq; fuerit, defuit, ac ejus loco adhiberi cæpit Electio quasi Dignioris, quum non semper Antiquior videretur dignissimus, hinc rerum Ordo paulatim mutari & Distinctum ægyptiæ Nomen, tum & Dignitas Superior & POTESTAS postmodum, jam hæc, tum illa, in aliis tandem maxima succrevit. p. 49, 50. Vide plura p. 90.

Et in Epistola de Independentismo non solum Cyprianum ejusdem cum Augustino speciei concedit fuisse Episcopum p. 16, 17, 18. sed etiam p. 87, 88. contra Independentem in

hunc modum Arguit. Quis vero existimet, in Civitatibus amplioribus, ubi in varios cætus Coire Ecclesia necesse habuit, singulis cætibz ubique fuisse suum singulare Presbyterium, & unamquamque Congregationem fuisse singularem Ecclesiam, uti totidem Ecclesiæ esse debuerint una in Civitate, & Synedria totidem quot cætus, nec dependerent vel Coniuncti fuerint cum aliis Communi Regimine? Possimurn, si rationem habeamus civitatum & ECCLESIARUM EPISCOPALIUM. An putamus CYPRIANUM quando Presbyterii sui facit Honorificam toties Mentionem intellexisse tot Congregationales in urbe & Diocesi sua Ecclesias & Presbyteria, quot forte erant Ecclesiarum cætus, & non potius Carthaginensis Cleri Consilium, & recturam in Cætus & Ecclesias ad se spectantes — Vide plura p. 90, 91.

§ LXII.

20. JOANNES DALLÆUS a Man of singular Diligence and Erudition, and a zealous asserter of Presbytery, in (n) Cap. 2. p. his second Book concerning Confirmation (n) affirms that the Ceremonies of Chrismation and Imposition of Hands after Baptism, [which the Church of Rome calls the Sacrament of Confirmation) were not introduced till the Distinction was made (o) C. 3 p. 112. between Bishops and Presbyters. And yet (o) he grants in express terms, that those Ceremonies were in use ante Tertii seculi initia, before the beginning of the Third Century. In (p) C. 4. p. 149. deed (p) he fairly owns Episcopacy to have been in Tertullian's time, even before he wrote his Book De Baptismo, for he understands that often mention'd Testimony *Dandi quidem jus habet*, &c. as all Mankind except G. R. have ever understood it, that is, as a clear Evidence of the Episcopal Authority in the Days of Tertullian. The same Author makes every whit as full Concessions in his Books, in which he endeavours to prove the Spuriousness of the Works commonly attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, and of Ignatius's Epistles. In the First Book, which is against the Works attributed to Dionysius, he insists on this Argument, That the Author of those Writings never so much as once calls those of the Superiour Order Episcopi, Bishops, but always *iepepai*, Chief Priests: And he never calls those whom the Church, A LITTLE AFTER THE APOSTLES distinguished from the Bishops, and Constituted in a SECOND ORDER, Presbyters, the Name commonly bestowed on them by all Christians, but always *iepar*, Priests. (q) And in the other Book which is against the Epistles of Ignatius, he makes it Palmarium Argumentum, a Principal, a first rate Argument against their being Genuine, that the Author so constantly distinguishes Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, as they were distinguished and signified distinct Orders in the Third Century (r) Would you have more? He affirms in most plain terms, That

That it is CLEARER THAN THE MID-DAY SUN, from such of Origen's Writings as are extant, and especially from St. Cyprian's Epistles, that, in the Third Century, not only the Offices and Functions, but also the Names of Bishop and Presbyter were distinguished all the Roman World over. (s)

pseudoDionysius) eo quo vulgo apud Nostros (i. e. Christianos) gaudebant. Presbyterorum nomine nunquam quod meminimus vo-

cat sed ispeas Sacerdotes perpetuo dicit. Lib. 1. Cap. 30. p. 171.

(r) Hic enim duo illa Nomina (Episcopi n. & Presbyteri) plane eodem sensu accipit quo a Tertii Seculi & sequentium Christianis, ad hæc usq; tempora accepta fuisse & scimus & libenter Concedimus, sic nimirum ut duas Dignitates a se invicem distinctas significent, Episcopusque is intelligatur qui Presbyter quidem ipse quoque est, sed & Presbyterio quoque præest, & in eorum Collegio Caput est; Presbyter vero is fit, qui Episcopo subest: unde necessario exurgunt tres in Ecclesia Ministrorum ORDINES, Episcopus PRIMUS & SUMMUS, Presbyter SECUNDUS & MEDIUS, Diaconus deniq; TERTIUS & INFIMUS. Lib. 2. Cap. 26. p. 386.

(s) Tertii jam ad Extrema vergentis seculi tempore — pene ubiq; in Orbe Romano, distincta fuisse Episcopi & Presbyteri non tantum Officia & Munia, sed etiam Nomina: ex iis quæ supersunt Origenis, & ex Cypriani maxime Epistolis, SOLE MERIDIANO CLARIUS EST. Lib. 2. Cap. 28. p. 462.

21. THE ANONYMOUS Author of the Observations §. LXIII. Dr. Pearson's Vindication of Ignatius's Epistles, and Dr.

Beveregius his Notes on the Apostolic Canons, as cited by Beveregius (t) acknowledges that the Distinction between Bishops and Presbyters was made towards the end of the second Century. (t) Cod. Can. Eccle. Primiti. Vind. L. 1. C. 1. §. 6. p. 7.

22. FRANCISCUS TURRETINUS, a late Genevian Divine of great Reputation with our Scottish Presbyterians, §. LXIV.

doth also very plainly give us his Concessions. He acknowledges Victor (who lived many Years before St. Cyprian) to have been Bishop of Rome. (u) But the things I would chiefly recommend to G. R.'s Consideration, are, That Turretin grants that Prelacy began to prevail very soon after the Apostles. (v) That he disputes only against the Divine Right of Episcopacy. (w) That against this Divine Right he takes an Argument from Ignatius's Epistles, which tho' he reckons Spurious, yet he allows (following Salmasius) to have been forged about the Year 150. That the force of this Argument lies in Episcopacy's being called a new Order, in one of those Epistles (x) That he assigns Jerom's Toto Orbe Decretum est (not to Jerom's own Time, as G. R. does, but) to the Year 150 (what moved him to give us the account in Blondel's very Words almost, and yet

(u) Inst. Theol. Elenct. part. 3. Loc. 18. Qu. 20. §. 4.

(v) -- Non quæri de jure Ecclesiastico quod arcessatur ex antiqua Consuetudine quæ non multis post Apostolorum

tempora cæpit
invalescere,
quod facile Con-
cedimus Qu.
21. §. 4.

to call it the Year 150, when *Blondel* calls it 140, let the Curious enquire. (y) And lastly, that over again he ascribes the Introduction of *Episcopacy* to the second Century. (z)

(w) Idem (n) *Presbyteris Episcopos non esse Jure Divino Prælatos*] patet ex Epistolis *Ignatio Martyri* falso adscriptis, nam Author, quisquis ille sit, qui scripsit circa Centesimum Quinquagesimum annum Christi; in Epistola ad *Magnesios* vocat *πρεσβυτέρων* & Ecclesiæ per illud administrationem *χρῆς νόμον* Christi legem, quia ex institutione & voluntate Christi per Apostolos Constituta est, at *νεωτερεῖν τὴν* Novellam institutionem quæ suo tempore Episcopum *Presbyteris* præponebat. *ibid.* §. 11. (x) *ibid.*

[y] Non sequitur jam tum decretum esse toto orbe [nempe dum primum a *Corinthiis* dictum Ego sum *Pauli*, &c.] ut unus aliquis cæteris præponeretur, sed tum successu temporis, postquam alii passim *Corinthiorum* exemplo dementati, in partes discerpti sunt, quod ante annum Christi 150 Contigisse probari non potest. *ibid.* §. 12.

[z] Si vero quærat *quando* Cæperit ista Distinctio, &c. Deinde *Systemate Blondeliano* de primo Ordinis breviter exposito, addit, quæ succedendi ratio per aliquod tempus mansit donec mutata fuerit sub finem SECUNDI SECULI: Tum enim primus Synedrii factus est per reliquorum *Presbyterorum* Electionem & Concessa est illi ALIQUA POTESTAS in *Sympresbyteros* quæ sensim per gradus crevit. *ibid.* §. 13.

§. LXV.

23. MELCHIOR LEIDECKERUS, an Author Cited by G. R. makes most plain Concessions in that same very Dissertation from which G. R. adduces a Testimony which he thinks makes for him. *Leidecker* I say, grants that in *Tertullian's* time *Presbyters* could not Baptize without the Bishops Authority. (a) He grants that the two Orders of Bishops and *Presbyters* were Distinguished, and that MORE POWER was conferred on the Bishops, so soon as (if not rather before) the Names were impropriated (b) referring the Reader for farther Satisfaction to *Blondel*, *Salmasius* and *Gersom Bucer*, whose Concessions I have already given in great enough plenty; nay, he fairly grants that *Episcopacy* had footing in Africa as early as Christianity it self, or at least, very soon after. (c)

ex Libro ejusdem de Baptismo. *Leidecker. Dessert. De Statu Eccl. Africanæ Sect. 5.*

[b] At cum lapsa tempore, unus ex ille Ordine eligi cæpit qui cæteris præponeretur AUCTA etiam POTESTATE, is adpellatus est solus Episcopus, cæteri vero *Presbyteri* Nempe cum Pares essent omnes, & in uno eodemq; gradu Consisterent, omnes tam Episcopi quam *Presbyteri* promiscue & absq; Discrimine dicebantur: Postquam autem Ordinum inductum est Discrimen, Nominum quoque distinctio simul invecata est. *ibid. Sect. 6.*

[c] Discrimen hoc [*Episcopum inter & Presbyterum*] in Africa invecatum est, quando Ecclesia ibi cæpit vel accrevit. Sic *Tert. L. de Bapt. Dandi Baptismi jus habet, &c.* Neque adeo mirum est lapsa tempore POTESTATEM EPISCOPALEM seu Usurpatione seu Adulatione accrevisse, ut Ordo ab institutione Primigenia plane Degeneraverit. Eadem Dissertatione Sect. 2.

BUT

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

107

113

BUT does not *Leidecker* say, that *Episcopacy in Africa was only a Title of Order and Presidency in the Presbytery*? Does he not say, that *The antient Liberty of the Presbytery was there retained*; and that *Bishops had only the Honour of Presidents, but no Domination over either Church or Presbyters*? Has not *G. R.* cited him fairly in his *Cyprianic Bishop examined*, §. 9. pag. 11? They are indeed *Leidecker's Words*, which *G. R.* has given: But to give us a few of any Author's Words is one thing, and to give his real Mind and Sentiments is another: And every Man of common sense will be convinced of this, who reads but that very Page from which *G. R.* took his Citation. In that same very Page, I say, a very few Lines before the Words transcribed by *G. R. Leidecker* tells us, *That the City of Carthage was divided into Parishes; each whereof had their own Presbyters and Deacons, who were employed in the Ministry, but did nothing in matters of Discipline or Government, without the Bishop's allowance; all those Parishes being subject to him* (d). And immediately before the Words cited by *G. R.* he thus, *Cæterum episcoporum jura in Africanis ecclesiis valde restricta erant, servatis antiquis Episcopatus legibus, atque adeo illis positi limites ne ministerio ad imperium abuterentur, aut presbyteratus honos quid detrimenti caperet. i. e. Nevertbeless, in the African Churches, the Rights of Bishops were much restricted; the antient Laws of Episcopacy being still retained; and they were so bounded, that they might not transform that which was only a Ministry into an absolute Sovereignty; or that the Honour of the Presbytery might suffer any Detriment.* And then follow the Words cited by *G. R.* *Namque ut, ab origine, Episcopatus, ordines, & præfidentie in presbyterio, titulus erat (quamvis alibi suos terminos egrederetur) in Africa vetus libertas presbyterii retenta est, dum Episcopi præfidentium honore, non DOMINATU in ecclesiam aut presbyteros gaudent. i. e. "For, as Episcopacy, at first, was a Title of Order and Presidency in a Presbytery (tho' elsewhere it transgressed its Bounds, yet) in Africa, the antient Liberty of the Presbytery was preserved; the Bishops enjoying the Honour of Presidents, but without DOMINATION over either Church or Presbyters.* And now let any Man of common Sense and common Ingenuity lay all these things together, and then let him tell me, if there is any probability that *Leidecker* had the least intention to assert a Parity between *Bishops and Presbyters* in the Words cited by *G. R.* But 'tis not

§ LXVI.

(d) Nempe omnes regiones uni SUB-ERANT Episcopo, at singulæ suos habebant presbyteros & diaconos illi ministerio occupabantur. Nihil tamen agentes in disciplina & regimine ecclesiastico, nisi cum Episcopi ipsius conscientia.

R

the

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

the first time that G. R. has suffer'd himself to be abused by a false notion of the Word [DOMINATUS.]

§ LXVII.

(b) p. 83.

BUT G. R. says, that *Leidecker* not only *asserteth* what is contained in the Testimony cited by him, but also *proveth it by divers Testimonies*. He does so: He proves his Point, whatever it was, by the Authority of *S. Austin*, citing *Serm. 234. De Tempore*; and by the *Canons* of such *African Councils* as *Austin* either was, or might have been present in. Now G. R. himself, in his *Good old Way defended* (b), has told us, that *Episcopacy was past its Meridian in the World, a little before S. Austin's time*. If *Leidecker* is such an Author as can cite such Testimonies for proving *Parity* in *S. Austin's time*; I wish G. R. much joy of him: But if it was not possible for him to be so ridiculous, then let some others look to themselves; for there is something ridiculous in the matter some way or other. And so much for *Leidecker*.

§ LXVIII.

(c) p. 25.

24. BUT is there never a *Scottish Presbyterian* that has confessed there was *Proper Prelacy* in the days of *S. Cyprian*? Yes, one I have found; the Author of *The Case of Accommodation, &c.* published Anno 1671. In the *Second Century* (says he) of the Church, this Prostatia could be more easily discovered: Yet seeing the better Pattern of the more pure and antient Times doth hold out no such thing, but an *Episcopal Parity* among the *Elders and Overseers, &c.* (c) And, Its (Episcopacy's) first setting up, as most acknowledg, was in the *Second Century*, in a simple *Protocathedria* to the *Senior Presbyter*. Shortly thereafter it turn'd to a *Prostatia* given by *Election*; and then still ascending, even under the *Discountenance and Persecution* of the *Heathen Powers and People*, it did, notwithstanding, what by *wresting the Elections* in many places from the *Presbyters*; and what by *usurping the Power of Ordination and Censures*, advance to a very high degree of *Prelacy*; as is abundantly confirmed by what may be gathered from the *Records of those Times*; and especially by good *CYPRIAN* his words to his *Presbyters*. A *primordio, &c.* Whereby, as it were, in opposition to the then corrupt custom of other *Bishops*, he plainly insinuates his contrary *Resolutions* (d). Here, indeed, are divers things observable; particularly, a *Gloss* on *S. Cyprian's A primordio, &c.* which I had not thought on. But proceed we with our Author; His Adversary had objected, that those who separated from the *Communion* of the *Scottish Bishops*, could not have lived in the *Communion* of the *Christian Church*.

(d) p. 28.

Church in the time of the Council of Nice; and must certainly have separated from the whole Catholick Church, in the days of the holy Bishop and Martyr Cyprian. What doth he answer to this? Doth he deny, that in S. Cyprian's time there was proper Prelacy? No such matter: What then? Plainly thus; so far as, at present, I am concern'd; *That in the Times to which he (his Adversary) refers, says he, there was an Episcopacy well advanced in the Church, and constantly a Corruption contracted in its Government, and yet withal quietly comported with, I do not deny* (e).

(e) p. 76.

THUS, for filling &c's BELL Y (which was put after 4) § LXIX. G. R. has already 4 times 4, and twice 4 to boot: If these 24 are not enough to blunt its Appetite, he may find more cramming for it, if he will be at pains to consider

25. Martin Bucer, lib. 2. *De Regno Christi*, cap. 12. And his Book concerning *The Cure of Souls*; in English, p. 380.

26. Hieronymus Zanchius, in his Confession of Faith, cap. 25. *Aphorif.* 10, 11. and his Observations on the same Aphorisms; and on the Fourth Commandment, *Quest.* 2. Col. 732, 733.

27. Musculus, as cited by Gersom Bucer, p. 571.

28. Danaus, cited by the same Bucer, p. 560.

29. Bullingerus, cited *ibid.* p. 290.

30. Amandus Polanus, *Syntag. lib.* 7. cap. 11.

31. *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, Lib. 3. Col. 129. Edit. 1608.

32. Paræus, in *Apocalypsin*, Col. 79. & 115.

33. Chemnitius, *Exam. Con. Trident. Part. II. pag.* 62.

34. Pezelius, *Refutat. Catechif. Jesuit. where, pag.* 34. *thus*, Constat enim inde usque ab Apostolorum temporibus receptum fuisse ut singulis civitatibus aut provinciis præficerentur Episcopi singuli. Neque unquam Episcopus aut Pastor unus præesse omnibus Ecclesiis particularibus, ac multo minus regere universam Ecclesiam catholicam potuit: So that he not only makes Episcopacy very early; as we have seen Chamier, Moulin, and many others do; but he likewise fairly shews, that from Episcopacy to Popery there is no good Consequence. But of this more afterward, viz. Chap. IX. § XXV.

35. Brightman, on *Revel.* ii. 1. pag. 49. Edit. Leyd. 1616.

36. Mr. Cartwright, as cited by Bancroft, in his *Survey of the Holy Discipline*, pag. 75, 78, 123, 384.

37. The Author of a Book from Scotland, cited *ibid.* p. 78.

38. Mr. Robinson, cited *ibid.* p. 390.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

39. Doctor Reynolds, cited *ibid.* p. 391.
40. Doctor Fulk, *ibid.* p. 392.
41. Mr. Sherewood, who wrote against Doctor Downam's Sermon, as cited by Downam in his Defence, lib. 2. p. 125, 135.
42. Mr. Andrew Melvin, in his *Scoti & n'xovl' & paraclesis, &c.* against Daniel Tilen's *Paranesis, &c.* cap. 6. § 3, 7, 17. & cap. 7. § 19. *imo passim.*
43. Didoclavius, or Calderwood, in *Altare Damascenum*, pag. 125, 126, 259, 302. If these two famous Scottish Authors have at any time contradicted themselves; the best G. R. can make of it, must be a Confirmation of his own Maxim, *viz.* that *Contradictory Assertions derogate from the Authority of the Asserter.*
44. Mr. Gillespie, in his *English Popish Ceremonies.*
45. Monsieur Gaches, cited by Dr. Durel, in his *View of Church Government, &c.* p. 125.
46. Monf. Le Moine, cited *ibid.* p. 130, 131.
47. Monf. De l'Angle, cited *ibid.* p. 143, 144.
48. Jacobus Lectius, cited *ibid.* p. 169, 170.
49. Doctor Porrè, cited *ibid.* p. 299, 300.
50. Burmannus, in his System, printed at Geneva, 1678. Vol. 2. lib. 8. cap. 13. § 6. says expressly (following his Masters Blondel and Salmasius) that *Episcopacy was introduced jam altero, ut videtur post Christum seculo.*
51. Joannes Vander Waeyen, Epistol. Apologet. adversus nuperas Frederici Spanhemii Literas. See above, § XXXIX. Marg.
52. Mr. Richard Baxter, in his Church History, chap. 1. § 58.
53. *A Discourse*, opening up the Nature of *Episcopacy*, as exercised in England, printed at London 1661. p. 2, 3.

§ LXX.

HERE are other XXIX. in all LIII. such a Number as I think may for once dine a pretty vast bellyed &c. But if G. R. will have it so gluttonous as to require more, I will hereafter disown it, as none of my &c's; for I never intended to make Monsters. And seeing G. R. has so stretch'd the Belly of it, let him either provide Food for it, or let it starve and dye. It has already exhausted my small Estate; for not one Morfel more have I at present to bestow upon it: I mean, I am not in a condition to give any more Presbyterian Authors by Retail: Yet, now when I think on it, I think I can direct G. R. how to find well stor'd Magazines. I can recommend to him in *Gross.*

§ LXXI.

1. ALL the true and genuine Disciples of the great Modern Masters, Beza, Chamier, Gersom Bacer, Blondel, Salmasius, &c. Now

Now can any Man pretend to be the sincere Disciple of such Masters, if he shall adventure to contradict them in such Concessions as I have shewn they have most plainly and unanimously made? And I am the more inclined to think I have good reason to recommend this to G. R.'s consideration, when I call to mind that many whom, I perswade my self, G. R. will readily own to have been great Scholars (such as the *Provincial Assembly of London*; the *Publishers of the English Annotations*; *Capellus*, *Amyraldus*, *Dallæus*, *Hornbeek*, *Turretine*, *Leidecker*, &c.) have been so very careful not to recede from them. I may recommend to G. R.

2. ALL who are, or can reasonably pretend to be the genuine Disciples of S. *Jerom*: For not only do *Calvin*, *Blondel*, *Salmasius*, &c. acknowledg, that *Jerom* allowed Episcopacy to have obtain'd before S. *Cyprian*'s time; but also, nothing plainer in S. *Jerom*'s own Writings, as were easie to prove, if it were needful. And § LXXII.

3. IF they have any regard to Consequences; All who make Episcopal Government the *Mystery of Iniquity*. For, if it is that *Mystery*, it began to work in the Days of the *Apostles*; very early in their Days. It had begun before S. *Paul* wrote his Second Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, which, as I take it, was written full Fifty Years before the Death of S. *John*. Now it may justly be deem'd a *Mystery*, an unfathomable *Mystery*, if, having begun to work so early, it had yet made no imaginable progress before, nor in the days of S. *Cyprian*. But how could it, by that time, have made any progress, if those, who were then called *Bishops*, had only the power of Moderators of *Presbyteries*? Only such a Power as was as much of *Divine Right*, of *Divine Institution*, and *Divine Approbation* as *Presbyteries*, nay, Churches themselves. What progress had the *Mystery of Iniquity* made (if Episcopacy was this *Mystery*) when there was nothing of proper *Prelacy* to be found? What progress had it made, so long as the Churches were still govern'd by *Pastors* (in the Presbyterian Sense) acting in *Parity*? The Sum is this: § LXXIII.

THAT it was not the *Dignity*, or the *Prebeminencie* of a Presbyterian Moderator, but real and proper *Prelacy* of power, which is confessed by all the Authors cited, to have obtained so early in the Church, is evident from that which has already been observed, and I do observe again, namely, That the *Dignity*, or the *Prebeminencie* of a Presbyterian Moderator, according to the Presbyterian § LXXIV.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

Presbyterian Principles was from the *beginning*: But the *Prelacy* I have adduced, so many Authors acknowledging to have been in *S. Cyprian's* time, if you will believe them, was only an *Human Institution of Ecclesiastical Establishment*, after the *days of the Apostles*. Neither was the *Change* which was so early made, only from *weekly*, or *monthly*, or *semestrial*, or *annual*, to *constant Moderators*. No, the most inquisitive of all I have cited, are very positive that **CONSTANT MODERATORS** were from the *beginning*: I have already shewn this concerning *Blondel* (f): And *Salmasius* is every whit as plain as he (g): So are *Ludovicus Capellus* (h), *Moyse Amyraldus* (i), *Joannes Hornbeek* (k), *Franciscus Turretinus* (l): In a word, all the faithful Followers of *Blondel* and *Salmasius*. And reason too; for of either *weekly*, or *monthly*, or *semestrial*, or *annual Moderators*; of any kind of Moderators that did not brook the Office *ad vitam vel culpam*, there is as profound a silence in Scripture and the Records of the first Three Centuries, as there is of *Cardinals* or *Abbots*, *Franciscans* or *Carthusians*. And now,

(f) Supra

§ XI.

(g) Walo

Mess. p. 27, 28,

127, 145, 205,

206, 249, 273,

274, 287, &

Apparat. ad

primatu Papæ,

p. 61, 62, 63,

65, 66, 67, 68,

69, 76, 91,

128, 130, 133.

(b) Thef. Salm. part. 3. Disp. 22. § 13.

(i) Thef. Salm. part. 3. Disp. 38. § 14, 19.

(k) Epist. De Episcopatu, p. 30. & 71. & De Independentismo, p. 103.

(l) Institut. Theol. Elenct. part. 3. Loc. 18. Qu. 21. § 13.

§ LXXV.

TO conclude this long Argument taken from the *Concessions* of the *greatest Advocates* I have seen for *Presbyterian Government*. From what hath been said, methinks the Reader may be sufficiently convinced of the *Rashness*, or at least, *Incogitancy* of all those *Scottish Proctors* for *Parity*, whom I mentioned *Chap. I.* from § X. to XXVI. and particularly of *G. R.* especially in the whole design of his *Cyprianic Bishop examined*. May I not now call it a shrewd *Presumption* against him, that he has so zealously attempted to *maintain*; that which so many, and those unquestionably the greatest, the wisest, the learnedst *Advocates* of his own Party did not think *maintainable*? What has *G. R.* to support him, or make it seem so much as probable that he could with any colour of reason, not barely forsake, but boldly contradict so many of his own best Friends, and the ablest *Advocates* for the Cause he stands for? Has he Reputation for Skill in Antiquity, for any kind of Learning, for Nimbleness at Thinking, for Dexterity at Reasoning,

soning, for Happiness at making new Discoveries, for Exactness at weighing Consequences, for any Faculty, or any Talent proper for a Controvertist, to bear him through in such a clear opposition to so many of the greatest Men of his own Faction? Or, had they not Zeal enough for their Cause? Or had they not Eyes to see, that it was no wise for their Interest or the Service of their Cause, to have made such *Concessions*? Or rather, is it to be suppos'd, that they would have made such *Concessions*, if plain Evidence had not forced them to it?

HOW advantageous had it been for their Cause? How much for the Credit of *Parity*? How much for the Honour the *Venerableness*, the *Preferableness* of Presbyterian Government, that it had been always the Government of the Christian Church, during the *Ages* of her greatest *Purity*; that is, during the *Ages* of her greatest *Persecutions*? During those *Ages* in which she had no Countenance from Civil Authority? Certainly, such an Advantage could not but have been of mighty Weight with all thinking Men. How great an Argument had it been of the Reasonableness of shaking off the Yoke of *Prelacy* in so many Churches at the *Reformation*? How proper had it been for the stopping the Mouths of *Papists*, who are so earnest to improve the *Antiquity* of *Episcopal* Government into a mighty *Prejudice* against such of the *Reformed Churches* as want it? When the Church did so much need to be *Reformed*, who can deny that it had been One good *Rule* of *Reformation*, to have reduc'd her Government to that *Form* which had been so carefully and so conscientiously preserved and stuck by through all the purest Centuries? Yet such *Brightness* of *Evidence*, it seems, the Authors whom I have cited, have seen for *Episcopacy's* having obtain'd even in those Centuries, as forced them to throw up such Notorious Advantages. In short,

THAT Calvin, Beza, Sadeel, Junius, Bucer, Moulin, Alstedius, Rivetus, Smectymnus, the Magdeburgenses, the Provincial Assembly of London, the Divines at Newport, the Publishers of the English Annotations, that Chamier, Blondel, Salmasius, Capellus, Amyraldus, Albertinus, Bochartus, Hornbeek, Dallæus, Turretinus, Leideckerus, &c. have made such *Concessions*, is clear as Light it self, clearer than the Mid-day Sun, as Daille words it. It is every whit as clear, that nothing but Force of Evidence can be presum'd to have prevailed with them to make such *Concessions*. And upon these two Suppositions I dare reason the matter

§ LXXVI.

§ LXXVII.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

matter thus with G. R. either they had *brighter Evidence* for the *Prevalency* of *Episcopacy* in the *Cyprianic Age*, than those I insisted on for it; or they had not: If they had, is not my *Cause* so much the firmer, and the *more impregnable*, as having *better Arguments* for it than any I produced? If they had not *better Evidences*, then it was either the *Light* of *lesser Evidences*; or of the *same* that forced them to make such *Concessions*: If *lesser Evidence* forced them to it, my *Cause* has still proportionably the *greater Advantage*, as being confirm'd by *greater Evidence* than that which seem'd sufficient to so many *Adversaries*, to oblige them to make such *Concessions*. If the very *same Evidences* which I produced forced so many *Adversaries* to make such *Concessions*, then how great a *Presumption* of *Obstinacy* must it needs be in G. R. that he will needs resist the *Evidences* which conquer'd so many of the most accomplish'd *Champions* of his own *Party*?

C H A P. IV.

The true state of the Main Controversie between the Prelatists and the Presbyterians fixed; and thereby, the Unserviceableness of G. R.'s main Subterfuges fully represented.

§ I.

IN pursuance of the Method I propos'd, I come now to try the *Solidity* and *Serviceableness* of the *main Answers* return'd by G. R. to the other *Arguments* I insisted on to prove that there was *real* and *proper Episcopacy* in S. Cyprian's time. Of these *Answers*, *One*, and indeed the *chief One* is, that such or such an *Argument*, or *Testimony*, or *Authority*, does not prove that the **SOLE POWER of ORDINATION and JURISDICTION** was lodged in the *Cyprianic Bishop's Person*, and therefore does not prove, that in S. Cyprian's time there was *proper Episcopacy*, true *Prelacy*, such *Prelatic Government* as is pleaded for by the *Scottish Prelatists*.

§ II.

G. R. had indeed laid the *Foundation* for this *Answer* in that *Paragraph* of his *Defence*, of his *Second Vindication* which I took to task. He had insinuated there, that we who in *Scotland* do stand for *Episcopacy*, do assign the **SOLE POWER** of
Ordination

Ordination and Jurisdiction to our Diocesan Bishop. This I rejected as no just state of the Controversie. My words were, *When did our Bishops claim that Sole Power? When was it ascribed to them by the Constitution? When did any of our Bishops attempt to exercise it? When did a Scottish Bishop offer, e. g. to ordain or depose a Presbyter, without the Concurrence of other Presbyters? When was such a Sole Power deem'd necessary for raising a Bishop to all the due Elevations of the Episcopal Authority?* And that I might make the matter as plain as I could, I added thus; *How easie is it to distinguish between a SOLE and a CHIEF POWER? Between a Power superiour to all other Powers, and a Power exclusive of all other Powers? Between a Power without or against which no other Powers can act, tho' they may in conjunction with it, or subordination to it; and a Power destroying all other Powers, or disabling them from acting?* Thus I stated the main Controversie, that G. R. and every Reader might see, that, as the Constitution of the Government of the Church of Scotland did not lodge the Sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination in the Bishop's Person, so neither was I to maintain that such Power belonged to him.

THIS way of stating the Controversie has not at all suited § III. G. R.'s humour: He is very angry at it; and will needs have it to be a gross mis-stating of it. For, believe him, and the true Question is, Whether the Sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination be lodged in a Diocesan Bishop? This, he says, He always understood to be the main thing debated between the Presbyterians and Prelatists (a). And he endeavours to prove, with no little Zeal, that it must be so. And no wonder; for if mine be the just, and his an unjust state of the Controversie, his Party, generally, as well as himself, are fairly at a loss. (a) Cypr. Bish. Exam. § 6. p. 6.

UNLESS his be the true state of it, not only the Synod of § IV. London, and Smectymnus (faithfully enough cited by him, b) (b) *ibid.* but also the Presbyterian Writers, generally, have mis-stated it. And not only so, but a great many of their best Arguments against Episcopacy (as it must needs be in all Disputes, where the Controversie is not rightly stated) are naught and inconcludent; and their Answers to the best Arguments for it are useless and impertinent: Especially, very little Solidity, perhaps very little Sense will be to be found in all those fierce Clamours, and those mighty Noises against Prelatic Tyranny and Domination, wherewith they are so earnest to render Episcopal Govern-

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

ment so odious and unsavory to the less thinking and less inquisitive Multitude. And more particularly, as to G. R. if he has here *mis stated* the Controversie, he has *mis-stated* it, and *mis understood* it all his life: At least, he has seldom *stated* it otherwise: Once or twice, I do remember, he has *stated* it right, indeed, when forced to it, to serve a present Turn, as we may learn hereafter: But he has so *stated* it *for the most part*; ever, while under *no Force*; as may appear to any who shall read his Books, particularly, his *Rational Defence of Nonconformity* (c); and his *Good old way defended* (d). Indeed, if he be not allowed his own way of stating it; (besides that the most part of § 36, 37, 38. which are the most considerable in all his Book, will be found (to give it in his own Language) to be nothing but making a Parade with a parcel of impertinent Citations) it will be found that he has said just nothing to the far greater part of my Book; this Subterfuge of the **SOLE POWER** being his great Sanctuary; more than 40 or 50 times his *only* or his *main* Answer to my Arguments.

(c) p. 154,
169, 170, 171,
174, 176, 177,
178, 182, 189.
(d) p. 10, 30,
36, 49, 60, 64,
65, 69, 78, 88,
101, 106, 124,
125, 126, 127,
128, 129, 137,
144, 146, 154.

§ V.

IT is visibly then of great Importance for determining our present Debate, that it be fairly and fully tried, whether he or I have rightly *stated* the main Controversie. I affirm that I have done it. I am very confident that I have done it, if there is no more to be said against my *stating* of it, than what is said by G. R. All he has said may be reduced to these Four Heads; I. *That my Distinctions between a CHIEF and a SOLE Power, &c. are useless; and he knows not what they can serve for, but to make a noise with Words* (e). II. *That my ascribing only a CHIEF Power, &c. is contrary to the main Design of my Book.* III. *That by the Scottish Constitution, the SOLE POWER of Jurisdiction and Ordination is given to the Bishop.* And IV. *That I am singular in stating the Controversie as I have done; and that I shall not be able to find many (if any one) on either side, that ever stated it without regard to SOLE POWER.* I shall very briefly discuss the first Three; for indeed they do not give me much trouble.

(e) § 7. p. 7.

§ VI.

I. AS for the *First*, which is, *That my Distinctions are useless; they cannot be applied to the Case in hand, &c.* I think I have said enough, when I have told him just over again how I state the matter, *viz.* Thus; I do ascribe to a Diocesan Bishop only a **CHIEF POWER**, and not a **SOLE POWER** of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*; only a Power **SUPERIOUR** to all other Powers; not a Power **EXCLUSIVE** of all other Powers;

POWERS; only a POWER without or against which no other POWERS can act, tho' they may in conjunction with it, or subordination to it; not a POWER destroying all other POWERS, or disabling them from acting. Did ever G. R. see Distinctions more easily applied? This, I say, is enough in all conscience for removeing intirely G. R.'s First Objection against my stating of the Question; so that what follows might be very well spared, but that I am willing to let the Reader see how substantially G. R. can trifle.

WOULD you know G. R.'s reason for the uneasiness of applying such Distinctions? It is even this, *That our Question is about SOLE POWER; and if I deny the Bishops that, whatever other Power I give 'em, I make them no such Bishops as afterwards I plead for* (f). Now what can be more pertinently replied to this, than that our Question is not about SOLE POWER; and that I do not here plead for the SOLE POWER of Bishops? Had he called it *his* Question, perhaps I should have allowed him to have made what he pleas'd of it: But when he says *Our* Question, he takes me into the Bargain with him, and so I must be at least *Half Question stater*; and being *that*, I will not allow that *Our* Question is about SOLE POWER.

§ VII.

(f) *ibid.*

BESIDES, says he, *The word CHIEF is ambiguous*; and so he gives Four Senses of it; the 1st. is, that CHIEF may be taken for Dignity, and import no more, than that the Bishop's Power, tho' the same with the Presbyters, yet is more conspicuous, because of the Dignity of the Bishop's Person or Office. 2. By Chief, says G. R. may be meant, that the Bishop can do some Acts of Power which the Presbyter cannot do. Or 3. that the Presbyter's Power is derived from the Bishop. Or 4. that he cannot exercise it, unless the Bishop pleaseth. The first Sense, he supposes, will not please the Bishops. I do not say it will. Only I would gladly know, how it can be reasonable, that the Bishop should have more Dignity than Presbyters, and yet no more Power. And how it can be intelligible, that the Dignity of the Bishops Office should make his Power more conspicuous than the Power of Presbyters, if he has the same Power, and by consequence, the same Office with the Presbyters? In all the other Senses (continues he) the Bishops Power is SOLE, at least, as to these things about which he hath that Power. Yes, Sir, without question, it is every inch as true a Proposition, That the Bishops Power is

§ VIII.

SOLE, as to these things about which it is SOLE, as it is, That that which is nothing to the purpose, so far as it is such, is nothing to the purpose: Which I will still hold this, that you have said, to be, until you shall prove, that the Bishops having a peculiar Power to do some Acts, which Presbyters cannot do; or that the Presbyters having his Power originally from Divine Institution; but so as to be put in possession of it by the Ministry of the Bishop; or that the Bishops having a Negative over the Presbyter; until you shall prove, that any one or two of these Propositions, or even all three together, if you will, must necessarily infer, that the Bishop has the SOLE POWER of Jurisdiction and Ordination.

§ IX.

ALL he has to say of my *Second Distinction* is, that it is the same with the *first*, only, that it is in different words. True, I design'd it so. The third differeth little; nay, nothing at all; at least, I intended that it should differ nothing. I gave the same thing thrice over in different words, that I might the more plainly express it. Now would you know what G. R. had to say against the *Third*? Then take it in his own words; If Presbyters cannot act, except the Bishop please; and if they must follow his Light, whatever be their own, I see not what Power they have. But, pray Sir, who said that they must follow his Light, whatever be their own? Is it not one thing to say that they can do nothing without him, and another to say, they must do whatever he commands to be done? Try the matter in your own Family, e. g. Command your Son to marry his Sister: Is he bound to obey you, to follow your Light? And yet, I doubt not, you would think him a little undutiful, if he should marry any Woman without your Consent. By this time, I think, my Distinctions are even as useful as ever I took them to be.

§ X.

II. LET us next try if he has made it appear, that my ascribing to a Diocesan Bishop only a CHIEF POWER, &c. is inconsistent with the main design of my Book. This he attempts with Warmth enough: But with what Vigour? Let us
 (g) § 6. p. 5. hear him. He says (g), I ascribe SOLE Power to the Cyprianic Bishop. Burn my Book if that is in it; at least, in that Amplitude we are now considering. But have I not said, That the
 (h) *ibid.* Bishops Power is monarchical (h)? Yes, I own I have said that: And what then? Has every Monarch the Sole Power of Jurisdiction within his Dominions? e. g. Had Julius Caesar (after he turned Monarch of the Roman Empire) and all succeeding Emperours

perours such SOLE POWER? Was there never another Magistrate in all that vast Empire, that had any POWER of Jurisdiction, no not so much as a Subordinate one? Is not the King of Scotland a Monarch? And does his being that deprive all inferior Judges or Governours of all Power Jurisdictional? Did you never read *Exod.* 18. 21. or *Dan.* 6. 1, 2. or *Matth.* 8. 9. or *1 Pet.* 2. 13, 14? Turn to your Friend Calderwood, and he will tell you, that one may be a Monarch without such SOLE POWER (i); you have his words on the Margent. Nay, he can instruct you both plainly and solidly, how Presbyters may have Power, even by Divine Institution, even immediately from Christ; tho' in Subordination to a Bishop (k). Mr. Andrew Melvin himself can tell you, that every Pastor is a supreme Magistrate in his own Parish (l); nay, that the Government of every Parish is Monarchical (m). And yet you know full well, he was very far from excluding Ruling Elders from all Power of Government. I could, if it were needful, appeal to *Jerom*, to *Chamier*, to *Blondel*, to *Salmasius*, and many more of your pretended Friends for the No Absurdity of calling a Bishop a Monarch within his own Territory, but methinks Melvin and Calderwood may content you, or any Scottish Presbyterian. But of this more hereafter; it is enough, at present, that every Monarch has not the SOLE POWER of Jurisdiction within his Dominions.

(i) Quis enim nescit aliam esse Regiminis formam, cum pastores omnes Episcopi divinitus instituti, communi consilio & auxilio Ecclesiam gubernant: Aliam cum unus Antonomaltice dictus Episcopus nonnullam in Collegas potestatem habet, canonibus seu repagulis circumseptam ne in tyrannidem erumpat: aliam, cum solus in gregem & Presbyteros dominatur. Qui Aristocraticum regimen à monarchico temperato, aut mero distinguere non novit opus est illi collyrio ad persanandum Scotoma quo laborat. *Alt. Dam.* p. 113.

(k) Vide p. 211. fusè.

(l) Quemque in sua parœcia supremum esse Ecclesiasticum magistratum asserimus. Melvinus contra Tilenum, cap. 2. Sect. 13. Vide plura huc spectantia, cap. 10. § 18. & cap. 23. § 6.

(m) Ecclesiæ regimen modo quodam Monarchicum dicimus, viz. ubi pastores senioribus & seniores Diaconis præsunt. Verba sunt Henrici Jacob, Melvino citata simul & probata, cap. 2. § 20.

BUT do not I expressly say, pag. 38. that a Bishop, in § XI. S. Cyprian's time, had the Sole Power of Ordination (n)? I said (n) § 6. p. 5. so: But where did I say, he had the Sole Power of Jurisdiction? But if he had the Sole Power of Ordination; and I do not ascribe this Sole Power to our Scottish Bishops; then, by my own confession, they are not the Bishops of the Cyprianic Age—Neither can G. R. guess what kind of Animals I will make them: They must

(o) *ibid.*

must be a Species of Bishops that never Man pleaded for but my self; and he supposes, my Lords, the Bishops, will give me small Thanks for thus pleading their Cause (o). Yes; this is a home-Thrust: And yet, for all that, G. R. is a very merciful Man, and can even help an Adversary when in Streights. But has he help'd me out indeed? Never a Prelatist of them all could have done it more effectually. Turn no farther than to § IX. and you'll find it to a Hairs breadth: For, there, accounting how there was no substantial difference between the Form of Government in S. Cyprian's time, and the present Scottish Presbyterian Model. He tells us in so many words, Let it then be considered first, that we (Presbyterians) never thought nor said, that Church Government was in all its Modes and Circumstances in the Third Century (in which S. Cyprian lived) the same with what it is now amongst Scots Presbyterians. The Substance of Government may remain, and yet considerable Alterations be made, in the Modes of managing it, in the succession of Years, much more of Ages.—There hath been no Age of old, or in later times, in which there have not been some lesser Differences in Management, even among Churches which used the same Species of Church-Government for Substance: As at this day at Scotland, Low-Countries, Geneva, among the Switzers, &c. some Churches are more, and some less pure and near to the Pattern; and yet all govern'd by Presbyters acting in parity: And among the Prelatists, Prelatic Power is higher in one Church than in another; as in England now, and in Scotland of late: Wherefore our Author must not think to triumph, if he can shew some difference between the Cyprianic Age and our way. Now, Dear Sir, I thank you kindly for so good an Office. And so I proceed,

§ XII.

III. TO your next Attempt, which is to prove, That by the Scottish Constitution of Episcopacy, the Sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction is lodged in the Bishop's Person. Here you have shewn me no Favour, and therefore I must do for my self as well as I can. All your Proofs are taken from the *Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical*, appointed by the King's Authority, for the Church of Scotland, Anno 1635. Now in the first place, pray, be ingenuous, Sir, and tell me, Do not you know, that those *Canons* never took effect in the Church of Scotland? Do not you know that they were never insisted on as the *Canons* of the Church of Scotland, (as being in Force) by our Bishops, since the Restitution of Episcopal Government,

Anno

Anno 1662. Do not you know that there was this good Reason for it, That they were enjoined only by *Royal Authority*, never by *Authority* properly *Ecclesiastical*? That even that Excellent King who enjoined them, when he saw they did not well suit the then *Inclinations* of the *Nation*, retracted all the *Authority* he had once given them, and thereby depriv'd them of all colour of pretence to be the *Canons* of the *Church* of *Scotland*? If you know these things (and you are surprisingly a stranger to our *Scottish* Affairs, if you know them not) how can you imagine that I will allow of Arguments taken from those *Canons*, to prove, that by the *Scottish Constitution*, the *Bishop* is possessed of the *Sole Power* of *Jurisdiction* and *Ordination*? But this is not all.

WHAT have you adduced from those *Canons* that could have solidly made for you, supposing they had been the *standing Canons* of the *Church* of *Scotland*? All you bring for the *Bishops* **SOLE POWER** of *Ordination*, is the *Canon* which is to be found *Chap. 2. § 3.* the words are, *No person shall be hereafter received into Holy Orders, without due Examination of his Literature, by the Archbishop or Bishop of the Diocese, or by their Chaplains, appointed to that work, who shall examine every several Party, as they find cause.* Hence you argue, *The Examination of the Candidate, and consequently the power of determining who shall be ordained, is laid on the Bishop, &c.* Now it is plain, that if you had drawn your *Conclusion*, it must have been to this purpose; *ergo*, by the *Scottish Constitution*, the *Bishop* has the *Sole Power* of *Ordination*. Now let me imitate this way of Reasoning in two or three Instances, *e g.* By the *constant Practice* of the *Church* of *Scotland*, ever since *Episcopacy* was established, Anno 1610. that is, both before and since the Year 1635. the *Presbyters* of the respective *Presbyteries* have been the *only Examinators* of those who were to enter into the *Ministry*, at any *Church*, within the *Bounds* of those *Presbyteries*; *ergo*, by the *constant Practice* of the *Church* of *Scotland*, even under *Episcopacy*, *Presbyters* have had the *Sole Power* of *Ordination*. Again, all along under *Episcopacy*, nay even under *Presbytery*, till the year 1649. *Patrons*, for the most part *Laics*, had the *Nomination* of the *Person* who was to be examined and ordained; *ergo*, *Patrons*, tho for the most part *Laics*, had the *Sole Power* of both *Examination* and *Ordination*. Once more, by the *Presbyterian Principles*, by your own *Principles*, the *Principles* you have often published and pleaded for, the *People* have the *Nomination* and

Election

§ XIII.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

Election of the Candidate, &c. Ergo, by these Principles the People have the Sole Power of both *Examination* and *Ordination*. Now, Sir, I take you bound to own the Solidity of my Reasonings, as much as I am, to own the Solidity of yours; until you shall shew some substantial Difference between them.

§ XIV.

IT were every whit as easie to shew how unsuccessfully you have cited divers of those *Canons* (all you have cited) to prove the Bishops Sole Power of *Jurisdiction*. You argue, e g. thus, A *Person ordained to a Charge*, may not *preach*, unless he be also *licensed* by the Bishop: Ergo, the Bishop has the Sole Power of *Jurisdiction*. And I argue every way as closely, when I say, that by a certain *Act* of a certain *General Assembly* (I shall direct you to both the *Assembly* and the *Act*, when you put me to it), no Member of the *Assembly*, Minister, or Ruling Elder, has liberty to speak, without *Leave* first asked and obtained from the *Moderator*; Ergo, the *Moderator* even of a *Presbyterian Assembly*, has the Sole Power of *Jurisdiction*. In short, there is not one of the *Canons* you have produced, that by *Nineteen Consequences* can infer your *Conclusion*. And therefore I will not trouble the Reader with any more about them: And I hope he will pardon my forbearance to give him further trouble, upon my promising to prove from these same *Canons* (before I have done) that no such Sole Power, as G. R. pretends, is ascribed by them to the Bishop. In the mean time I proceed

§ XV.

IV. TO G. R.'s Fourth and last Plea; which is, That I am singular in stating the Controversie as I have done. He says, He cannot guess what kind of Animals I will make my Scottish Bishops (p); because I do not give them the SOLE POWER of Ordination and Jurisdiction; and, they must be a Species of Bishops that never Man pleaded for, but my self; And he supposes my Lords, the Bishops, will give me small Thanks (q) § 6. p. 6. for thus pleading their Cause. And again (q), he says, He always understood that the main thing debated between us (the Presbyterians) and the Prelatists, was about the Sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination, and that he is not alone in this; that the Synod of London, in their Vindication of Presbyterian Government, p. 24. and Smectymnus, § 8, 9. propose the Controversie in the same words; And that he thinks I will not find many, if any one, of either side, who handleth the Question without (r) § 6. p. 6. respect to this Power (r). To the scurrilous part of this Plea

I shall say nothing. What Gain he has made, of his *always* understanding the Controversie to be stated on the *Sole Power*, may be considered in due time. It is indeed a matter of some weight, that I will not find many, if any one, of either side, who has stated it otherwise; if it be true, it is no small Presumption against me; and therefore I shall try it as fully as is necessary, and as fairly as I can. And

IN the first place, I shall readily grant, that it is, indeed, very ordinary with those of his *side*, to have their recourse to the *Solitude of Power*, as he somewhere calls it (f); as if (f) § 17. p. 21. it were the great *Hinge* of the Controversie. Besides the *Synod of London*, *Smectymnus*, and *himself*, it were easie to adduce a great many more of his Party, who labour zealously in the Controversie, as if this were the *main State* of it. But I shall only, at present, take notice of one, namely, his *Friend and Fellow-Principal*, *Thomas Forrester*, *Principal* of the *New College* in *S. Andrews*. I take notice of him for two Reasons, one is, that (just like *G. R.*) this *T. F.* whether his Adversaries will or no, will needs have the *Sole Power* to be the *main thing* controverted; the other, that he has something which seems to be peculiar to himself in this matter.

I. WHETHER his Adversaries will or no, he will needs § XVII. have the Bishops *Sole Power* to be the *main thing* controverted. This famous Author has written *Two Books*, which I have seen; one under the Title of *Rectius instruendum*, printed Anno 1684. the other bearing the Name of *The Hierarchical Bishop's Claim to a Divine Right*, tryed at the Scripture Bar, &c. printed this current Year 1699. In his *Rectius instruendum* (t), (t) pag. 211. he fairly confesseth, that the Adversary against whom he wrote it, did make it compatible with *Prelacy*, that *Presbyters should have an hand in the Government*: And yet all along, his great Work is to batter down the *Sole Power of Bishops* (u). (u) See p. 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 22, 81, 84, 90, 92, 110, 128, 146, 147, 156, 157, 160, 175, 187, 211, 225, 230, 263, 277.

HE runs the same Course in his *Hierarchical Bishop's Claim*. § XVIII. There, he wrestles with Three Adversaries, *Doctor Scott*, *Doctor Monro*, and *Bishop Honyman*. I have not had the opportunity to consider *Dr. Scott*; but sure I am, the other Two were not Advocates for the *Sole Power of Bishops*; as I shall shew hereafter: Yet this doughtie Author, in his Writings

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

against them, must pelt it, on every occasion, as if they had maintain'd it. Whoso would see how keenly he has been at it, against Dr. *Monro*, may consult the Pages on the Margin (u). But the pleasantest work is with *Honyman*; for T. F. frankly confesses, that that Learned Bishop did not plead for the *Sole Power* of Bishops. But what the better is the Bishop for that? *The Surveyor*, says T. F. doth but shuffle and obscure the true state of the Question betwixt Episcopalians and Presbyterians, which is this, viz. Upon our supposal of that Authority and Government ascribed, in Scripture, to Pastors or Presbyters, and their essential Interest therein; how an Officer, who is pretended to be distinct from them, and superiour unto them, and **ENHANCING and CONCENTERING ALL THEIR POWER IN HIMSELF**, can be consistent with the Scripture Prescriptions in point of Government (w)? And having thus stated the Controverlie according to his own Mind, and so as, he thought, he could find something to say; he mercilessly pursues the *Sole Power* upon all occasions (x). Is not this very pleasant? And yet the same ingenious Author, when he found it proper for him, could tell Dr. *Scott*, and, in a manner, thereby, reprove his Ignorance, that our Scots Episcopalians, and many of the English, plead for such an Episcopal Power as is managed in conjunction with Presbyters, and profess to own only such a fixed Presidency of the Bishops over the Pastors, in Government, as allows them a share and interest therein, and do consequently disown what the Doctor asserts; That the Bishop is the Sole Subject of Government: And for this, he refers the Doctor to Bishop *Honyman*, Part II. *Survey of Naphthali* (the very place in which he had complained, that *Honyman* had mis-stated the Question), and to Dr. *Burnet*, to Bishop *Lighton's* two Letters, and to Bishop *Hall* (y). Must not this *Principal* be a pretty pleasant Fellow? But I proceed.

2. THIS Author has something which seems to be peculiar to him in this matter; namely, that he frequently confounds a **NEGATIVE VOICE** and a **SOLE POWER**; or, at least, makes them consistent. I am not willing to lye under the suspicion of being injurious to him; and therefore I shall transcribe his own words from his own Books. Let them (the Prelatists, says he) shew where the word *ἐπίσκοπος* denotes such an Officer as they have shapen out, viz. A *Diocesan Prelat* having **SOLE POWER** of Ordination and Jurisdiction over a whole

(u) 10, 16, 26, 29, 33, 34, 68, 119, 123, 128, 129, 138.

(w) pag. 2.

(x) See p. 4, 5, 8, 11, 20, 22, 26, 28, 37, 55.

(y) Scots Pleadings examined, p. 3.

§ XIX.

whole Diocese, with a **NEGATIVE VOICE**, and a **SOLE DECISIVE SUFFRAGE** in the Church Judicatories thereof (z). Again, They (Presbyters) are subject to him (the (z) Rectius Bishop) as their proper **SOLE** Judge and Censurer, by Ecclesiastical Censures of Suspension, Deposition, Excommunication: The **DECISIVE POWER**, in Church Judicatories, is properly his; for the unanimous Acts and Conclusions of the Diocesan Synod fall under his Cognisance, to be ratified or cassat, at his pleasure: He is the **SINE QUO NON**, and hath a **NEGATIVE VOICE** in the Judicatories (a). He defines a Scottish Prelat thus; An ordinary Church Officer assuming the Government of some Hundreds of Congregations, as monopoliz'd in him, and conveyed according to his pleasure, unto the Ministers thereof; having **SOLE POWER** in Ordination and Jurisdiction, and a **NEGATIVE VOICE** in Church Judicatories, and whose proper Work is Ruling only, not Feeding by Doctrine (b). He tells (b) ibid. 65. his Adversary, that if he would conclude any thing to purpose, he must prove the Prelat's **SOLE DECISIVE POWER** and **NEGATIVE VOICE** in Judicatories (c). And his Adversary cannot shew, that either the High Priest, or any inferiour Priests, had the **SOLE DECISIVE SUFFRAGE** in their Ecclesiastical Courts; or such a **NEGATIVE VOICE** as the Prelats exercise, and assume in their pretended Synods and Presbyteries (d). (c) p. 111. (d) p. 113. And, Did the Apostles (as our Prelats) assume a **SOLE DECISIVE CONCLUSIVE SUFFRAGE**, and a **NEGATIVE VOICE** over Church Judicatories, notwithstanding their extraordinary and high Prerogatives (e)? Further yet, Our present Prelats are **SOLE**, both in Ordination and Jurisdiction, and assume a **NEGATIVE VOICE** in Church Judicatories (f). Nay, he (e) p. 121. (f) p. 212. even confounds **CHIEF** and **SOLE**; for accounting how Beza distinguishes the *Episcopus Humanus* from the *Diocesan Prelat* (g), whom his Adversary pleaded for. He says, This (g) p. 180. *Diocesan Prelat* hath the **CHIEF** and **SOLE POWER** in Ordination and Jurisdiction, and is the *Satanical Bishop*.

NEITHER has his Head been clearer, when he wrote his *Hierarchical Bishop's Claim, &c.* for even there, also, the **SOLE POWER** and the **NEGATIVE VOICE** go hand in hand; for instance, in his Examination of Dr. Scott's Pleadings (h), (h) pag. 3. he says, The Prelat's **NEGATIVE VOICE** and **SOLE DECISIVE POWER** in Judicatories, is point blank contrary to the Apostles Carriage in the Synod, Act 15. And in his Examination

(i) p. 129. of Dr. Monro's Pleadings, he discourses thus (i), *The Bishop hath SOLE ABSOLUTE POWER in Ordination and Jurisdiction over all Pastors of the Diocese; Timothy had no such Authority, but only of an Inspector and Moderator for the time of his transient Mission: The Bishops assume a NEGATIVE VOICE in all Judicatories in the Diocese, which the Doctor here owns; for he will have them subject to no Collegiat Meeting of Pastors: Had Timothy assumed this, he had contradicted and baffled the Apostles Carriage, Act 15.*

§ XXI.

(k) p. 98.

IT were easie to collect a great many more of this Authors most mysterious Notions about Power; e. g. in his Examination of Dr. Monro's Pleadings (k), he says, *The Presbyterians hold, that the Apostles had a SUPREME (i. e. COLLATERAL and EQUAL) and Spiritual Power and Authority over Officers and Members of the Church. Yes, Sir, it was a SUPREME POWER, and it was a POWER OVER both Officers and Members; and yet it was but COLLATERAL and EQUAL. Again, He will have the Doctor to prove, that Timothy had an Office formally and properly Episcopal, or such as did import a SOLE and SINGULAR Authority, PARAMOUNT to all the Ordinary OFFICER'S AUTHORITY in the Church, and EXCLUSIVE thereof (l). Did you ever see more Mysteries in one short Sentence? SOLE and SINGULAR Authority are one and the same thing: And this sole and singular Authority is PARAMOUNT to the Authority of all the Ordinary Officers; So that there are Ordinary Officers besides the Bishop, who have Authority; for how can his be PARAMOUNT to theirs, if they have none? And yet, whatever Authority they have, it is certain they have no Authority; for the Bishops Authority is not only Paramount to theirs, but EXCLUSIVE thereof. It were easie, I say, to collect a great many more such superfine Notions from this Author's Writings; but the Specimen I have given is enough for my purpose; for*

(l) p. 119.

§ XXII.

WHAT can be greater Nonsense, than to suppose that the SOLE POWER of Jurisdiction, and a NEGATIVE VOICE are one and the same thing? Or that they can consist, or dwell in one anothers Neighbourhood? If the Bishop has the SOLE POWER, then 'tis plain Demonstration, that no other Body can have ANY POWER: But if no other Body has ANY POWER, how can the Bishop have a NEGATIVE VOICE? Can you conceive a NEGATIVE VOICE, without relation

to OTHER VOICES? But how can there be OTHER VOICES if there is no POWER to PRODUCE them? And where can there be any Power to produce them, if ALL POWER be SOLELY in the Bishop? Neither can CHIEF and SOLE consist any better: who can conceive a CHIEF POWER without a relation to some Power or Powers which are NOT chief? You may as well conceive a *Superiour* without an *Inferiour*, or a *First* without a *Second*. And what Sense is it to talk of *Church Judicatories* any manner of way contradistinct from the Bishop (which yet you see this Author ordinarily does) if the SOLE POWER of *Jurisdiction*, and, by consequence, of *Judging* be lodged in the Bishop's Person? What sort of *Judicatories* can they be which have no Power to *Judge*? And how can they have any Power to *Judge*, if the Bishop have the Sole Power of *Judging*?

BY what I have thus briefly remarked concerning this Author, (an Author inferiour to none of his Tribe for Confidence and Insolence, and a petulant Contempt of his Adversaries,) the Reader may see how keen he has been against the Sole Power of Bishops, as if that had been the main thing controverted; and withal he may competently judge (especially if he remembers the little hint I gave before (m) of his Learning and Skill in Antiquity) whether this *Principal's* Books can have such strength of Reason in them, as they are commonly pretended to contain by those of the Party; and whether there is reason to proclaim them *Unanswerable*. For how can we expect either much *Sound* or much *sanctified Reason*, in a *suitable Methodical Invention* ('tis one of his own Flights in his *Examination of the Surveyers* (n) *Pleadings*) from one who has not only written so licentiously and bitterly as he has done, but also all along has blunder'd so extravagantly, and disgorged so much substantial and surprising Nonsense about the state of the main Question? And so I leave him for this Bout, and return to G. R. our other learned *Principal*.

THO I have thus readily granted that it is very ordinary with those of G. R.'s side, to have recourse to the *Solitude of Power*, as if it were the only hinge of the Controversie; yet he must not think he has gain'd so much as one inch of ground, unless I cannot find any of my side who has stated the Question as I have done: for if he and his Party are so willing to *misstate* it, who can help it? or what can they gain by it? I come therefore,

§ XXIII.

(m) Chap. II.
§ XXIX, &
XL.

(n) p. 66.

§ XXIV.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

therefore, now, to try if there have been any *Advocates* for *Prelacy*, who yet have not pleaded for the Bishops **SOLE POWER** in *Jurisdiction* and *Ordination*. And here I might very fairly make short work of it: For besides that which his Brother T. F. has so frankly confessed concerning our *Scottish* Episcopalians, and many of the *English*, viz. *That they do not plead for any such absolute Power in Bishops* (o). Besides this, I say, even G. R. himself has fairly done my Business, some years ago, in his *Rational Defence of Nonconformity*. For there in the *third Section* of his *third Part*, (which *Section* he intitles *Whether Diocesan Episcopacy be Lawful?*) I read thus (p) *It will contribute to our clear and sure Procedure in this Controversie (concerning the Lawfulness of Diocesan Episcopacy) if we consider the Difference and Inconsistency that is among our Prelatic Brethren, about the Episcopacy that they assert, and the Foundation on which they build it: As to the thing, some of them do so restrain the Power of Bishops, denying both SOLE ORDINATION and SOLE JURISDICTION to them, that they make it little or no more but a Presidency: So the Learned and Pious USHER, who is followed by MANY of the more SOBER and LEARNED of that Party—— Others allow them a Jurisdiction over other Pastors of the Church, and exempt them from being liable to the Censures of their Brethren, (i. e. the Presbyters within their Diocese) yet so, as they ought not to Rule BY THEMSELVES, but with the Consent of the Pastors of the Church, who are to be their Council.*

(o) *Supra*
§ XVIII.

(p) § IV. p.
158, 159.

§ XXV.

THESE, I say, are G. R.'s own Words. Let others judge whether it was a Defect of Memory or Ingenuity in him, that, having written so in his *Rational Defence*, &c. he should yet so confidently have said in his *Cyprianic Bishop Examined*, *That Never Man but my self pleaded for Bishops without SOLE POWER of Jurisdiction and Ordination; And that I would not find many if any one that stated the Controversie otherwise than concerning this SOLE POWER.* For my part, I think it is enough that he has so fairly purg'd me of *Singularity* in this matter: So very fairly, that if I were concern'd for no more than barely to defend my self, I might freely forbear to add so much as one word more upon this Subject. But I have indeed more in my prospect, no less than intirely to deprive G. R. and all his Brethren hereafter, of this their common *Subterfuge*; and to render them utterly *inexcusable* if ever they shall betake themselves

to the sorry Plea of the Sole Power. Which I think shall be done to purpose, if I can make these things appear; 1. That the Most and Most Eminent of the *Advocates* for *Prelacy*, both in *Scotland* and *England*, profess to plead not for the Bishops SOLE but CHIEF POWER in Ordination and Jurisdiction; and so, that they fall in with me in my stating of the Question. 2. That the Constitution of neither Church ascribes such SOLE POWER to Bishops. And 3. That the True State of the Question is indeed, Whether the Church ought be governed by Pastors acting in Parity or Imparity?

1. I SAY, The Most and Most Eminent *Advocates* for *Prelacy*, both in *Scotland* and *England*, do not profess to plead for the SOLE, but for the CHIEF POWER, &c. I begin with my own Country men; and the first shall be, § XXVI.

1. K. JAMES VI, whom all must acknowledge to have had Zeal enough for Episcopal Government, and Knowledge enough to temper it with. I cite him first, not so much for his Quality, as that he is indeed the First Scottish Author I have found particularly pleading for Episcopacy. This great King did not only always order, in all Schemes of Ecclesiastical Government which he either drew or approved of, that Bishops should neither ordain, nor do any considerable Acts of Jurisdiction, without the Assistance of Presbyters, as afterwards I may have occasion to shew more fully: He not only makes PARITY, that against which he levels all his Arguments and Inclinations, the Preface to his ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚ. ΔΩΡ. but after he was settled in England, in the Conference at Hampton Court, on January 14. Anno 1604. he declared, He understood not why the Bishops, for the more Dignity to so high and weighty a Censure as Excommunication, should not take unto them, for their Assistants, the Dean and Chapter, or other Ministers and Chaplains of Gravity and Account, and so likewise in other Censures, and giving of Orders. Was this pleading for the Sole Power of Bishops? § XXVII.

2. COWPER, the Learned Bishop of Galloway, in his Preface to his *Dicaiology*. (publish'd Anno 1614.) tells that all he undertook to maintain was, That No substantial Point of Discipline was changed in our Church (by the Erection of Episcopacy Anno 1610.) because Ecclesiastical Synods, formerly in use, were still retained; and the Censures of Admonition, Suspension, Excommunication, the Admission (i. e. the Ordination) of Pastors, and their Deposition, and whatever else pertains to the matter of

of

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

(q) § 122.
P. 117.

of Discipline, were not removed, but rectified and roborated, in as much as the Power to moderate and exercise these Censures was not left free to every one, but restored to the Bishop, to be used with the Advice of his Brethren, i. e. the Presbyters. And in the Book it self, (q) he tells his Adversary Hume, That All Antiquity could inform him that a Bishop without a Presbytery, is a Head without a Body, and a Presbytery without a Bishop, a Body without a Head; That by a Presbytery he understands that which Ignatius calls *Συνήλη τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ*, the Consistory of the Bishop, subordinate to him, and serving for Assistance of him in weighty matters. And § 138. he not only insists pretty fully in shewing that the Episcopacy then established did not substantially differ from the Superintendency settled at the Reformation; but when Hume objects that the Superintendents acted by Advice; he answers thus, Good Reason, (viz. that the Superintendents did not claim a Sole Power) see the Law prescribed to Bishops of old, Anno 1573. which is, That no Bishop admit (i. e. ordain) any Minister without Advice (i. e. Assistance or Concurrence) of three well qualified Ministers of the Bounds: The same stands now (says he) and can you say that any Bishop in our Church stands against this, except only that where the Law binds them to use the Advice of three, they use the Advice of six, ten, or thirteen, if they may get them? What say you against this Mr. David? See you any other a Constant Form of Government in our Church? See you any other Bishops now than were in the Days of John Knox? Much more might be adduced from this Bishop: But this is enough.

§ XXIX.

(r) See pag.
200, 201.

3. PETER HAY, Gentleman of North-Britain, in his Book intitled, *A Vision of Balaam's Ass*, printed at London, An. 1616. (the 10th and 11th. Chapters whereof argue him to have been a zealous Pleader for Episcopacy) proposes this Question (r) What ought to be the temperate Government of Bishops? And answers thus, They are to learn the Arts of Government from God himself; who albeit he have both absolute and infinite Power, so that he could, of the Stones of the Earth, raise up Seed to Abraham, and bring any thing to pass suddenly and in a moment, in the Generation of whatsoever of his Creatures; yet, for the maintenance of their Order and Policy, he doth adjoin to his working, the ordinary Concurrence of Second and Inferiour Causes, making things to go on by natural and mutual means. And that they ought to follow the Example of Moyses, in the Jewish Rule of God's People, not as the Presbyterians do, following the Archetype for the Laic Elders,

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

137

Elders, and refusing it for the Prelacy; they must not only imitate Moyses, where it serveth to establish their Power, but also in that which S. Jerom doth record of Moyses, *Qui cum solus præesse populo haberet in potestate, Who having it in his Will to be only over the People, yet he did adjoyn unto him Seventy to assist him.* Thus he argues from both Patterns, from the greater to the lesser; as if he had said, If God, who has Absolute Power; and if Moyses, who had once SOLE POWER, did so and so, much more ought Bishops to do it. That he reasons so, is plain from what he adds, *viz. That by the Antient Canons, and the Practice of the Primitive Bishops, such as Ignatius, Cyprian, Ambrose, &c. the Presbyters concurr'd with the Bishop in the Administration of the Government and Discipline.* And, that this kind of Government doth much ease the Bishops in the Discharge of their Office, and derogates nothing from their Authority; for who will say (says he) that a temperate Monarch who followeth his grave Counsel doth hereby lessen his Power?

4. ARCHB. SPOTSWOOD, as he has no where pleaded for the SOLE POWER of Bishops, so, in his *Refutatio Libelli, &c.* printed at London, Anno 1620. He says expressly, that Neither he, nor his Collegues, the rest of the Scottish Bishops, do pretend to any more Power than the Primitive Bishops had, or than was enjoyed by the Superintendents in this Church after the Reformation (s). From which, methinks, the Consequence is pretty obvious, *viz.* That neither he nor they claim'd such Power as G. R. makes the Hinge of the Controversie.

§ XXX

(c) Nec aliud
Episcoporum
genus sumus
quam qui ab
incunabilis

Christianæ Religionis Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ præfuerunt, veterrimorum præfulum legitimi successores, nec potestatem ullam nobis vindicamus quam ab initio superintendentes, & eos subsequuti præfules, si per adversarios licuisset, non vindicassent; ut absurda prorsus & ridicula sit illa Sæctarii distinctio in primum, secundum, & tertium Episcoporum genus, p. 89, 90.

5. TO the same purpose it is pleaded by Dr. LINDESAY, Bishop of Brechin, in his *True Narrations of the Proceedings of the Assembly at Perth, Anno 1618.* and *His just Defence of the Articles therein concluded, &c.* Printed at London, Anno 1621. For, upon all occasions, he affirms, our Superintendents to have been Bishops; and he never pleads for more Power than was exercised by them. Thus having asserted (and justly too) that Episcopacy was sworn to in the Negative Confession,

§ XXXI

U

Anno

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

Anno 1581. He attacks his Adversary in these words, *I demand what is the cause, that you and your Followers do not only refuse to obey, but improve and impugn the most principle Point of Policy, set down in that Book (the first Book of Discipline) namely, the Office of Bishops, whose Provision, Jurisdiction, Power, and Election, are particularly described in the first Head of that Book, under the Name of Superintendents (t)?* And upon another occasion, viz. when discoursing of Confirmation, his Adversary having said, that Episcopacy was abjured, Anno 1581. He answers, by telling him that it was not *abjured*, but *approved*; for there (by his Adversary's Confession) *the Policy set down in the first Book of Discipline was sworn to; but by that Book, Superintendency was established.* Now (says he (u) *If you have sworn that this is lawful in the Person of the Superintendent, viz. to visit Churches, &c. how can you call it a damnable Presumption, in the Person of a Bishop, whose Function and Name is the same, &c.*

(t) Num-
eration 2d. pag.
13.

(u) Num. 3.
pag. 99.

§ XXXII.

6. TO transcribe all that Dr. FORBES has to this purpose in his *Irenicum*, Printed at *Aberdeen*, Anno 1629. would require some Sheets: Nor is it needful, seeing he is so frequently cited even by Presbyterians (v), referring the Reader therefore to the Pages of that *Irenicum*, cited on the Margent (w). I shall only transcribe one Testimony from his excellent *Instructiones Historico-Theologicae* (x), in which he rejects the Sole Power of Bishops in as express Terms as the Wit of Man can imagin.

(v) See Gil-
lespie's English
Popish Cere-
monies, part 3.
pag. 192. And
Appendix to
Jus Divinum
Minist. &c.

pag. 130, 132, 134, 142. And Baxter's Third Disputation about Church Government, page 346.

(w) Vide à pagina 160, ad 148. ubi fusè tuetur Ordinationes à solis Presbyteris peractas. Vide etiam, p. 194. cum Addend. 472, 473. & Propositionem quantam, p. 142. Cum Addend. p. 468. & Propos. 9. p. 145. & Propos. 5. p. 143. & Prop. 13. p. 193. fusè, & p. 195. Cum Addend. p. 473.

(x) Lib. 16. cap. I. § 12 ibi enim primordiali Episcoporum aequalitate contra pontificem Romanum, firmis testimoniis adstructa, hæc habet: Quando autem supremum in Hierarchia Ecclesiastica locum Episcopis vindicamus, contra injustam usurpationem Romani Pontificis, non excludimus Presbyteros ab Ecclesiæ gubernatione; nec Episcopo in sua diocesi potestatem tribuimus *αὐτοκρατορικὴν*, neque authoritatem *θεωκρατικὴν*, vel absolutam aliquam concedimus Monarchiam: Nam accedimus judicio Catholicæ antiquitatis quæ cum Episcopo in regenda Ecclesia conjungit Presbyterium.

§ XXXIII.

7. SUCH being his Sentiments, it were scarcely to be doubted, that his Collegues, the rest of the Doctors of *Aberdeen* (Scrogie,

(Scrogie, Leslie, Baron, Sibbald, and Ross) would have said as much, had they had occasion; tho they had left nothing upon Record. But there is no need of this; for, indeed, they have said the same thing upon the matter, in their *Duplicates* to the Covenanters: For, there they not only make *Superintendents and Bishops all one, as to Power*, but they say expressly, that *the Legislative and Obligatory Power of the Church* (which I think even G. R. himself will not deny to be the noblest Branch of the Power of Jurisdiction) *is only in Synods or Conventions* (not of Bishops solely, but) *of Bishops and Presbyters* (y).

(y) 4th. Duply,
p 97, 98. Edit.
Aberdeen,
1653.

8. AS little do the *Bishops* plead for the *Sole Power* of either *Ordination* or *Jurisdiction*, in their accurate *Declinature*, presented in their Names by Dr. Hamilton, to the pretended *General Assembly* at *Glasgow*, Anno 1638. On the contrary, more than once they approve of the *Constitution* of such *General Assemblies* as were ordered by *Law*; and I think G. R. needs not be told, that in such *Assemblies* *Presbyters* had *Decisive Voices*. They do acknowledge and profess, that a *General Assembly*, lawfully called, and orderly convened, is a most necessary and effectual means for removing those *Evils* wherewith the Church was then infested (z). They decline not the lawful Tryal of any competent *Judicatorie* in the Kingdom, especially of a *General Assembly* lawfully constitute (a). They do most humbly intreat his Grace (the King's Commissioner) to intercede with his Majesty, that he may appoint a free and lawful *General Assembly*, such as God's Word, the Practice of the Primitive Church, and the Laws of the Kingdom do prescribe and allow (b). In deed, they except only against the *DECISIVE VOICES* of *Ruling Elders* in *General Assemblies* (c). And I hope G. R. needs not be told the common Axiom, *Exceptio firmat regulam in non exceptis*; that is, in plain Scotch, Seeing they did only except against the *Decisive Voices* of *Ruling Elders*, they did allow of the *Decisive Voices* of *Preaching Presbyters*. But what needs more? They plainly allow of the *Judicial Power* of *Presbyteries* acting by Rule, and within their own Sphere (d).

§ XXXIV.

(z) See Large Declaration,
p. 248.
(a) *ibid.* 261.

(b) *ib.* 263.

(c) *ib.* 254.

(d) *ib.* 259.

9. Dr. MAXWELL, sometime Bishop of Ross in Scotland, and afterwards Archbishop of Tuam in Ireland (one of the Bishops who concurr'd in the aforesaid *Declinature*, and, indeed, none of the meanest of them) in his accurate Piece, entituled, *Episcopacy not abjured in Scotland*; which he

§ XXXV.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

(e) See Ch. 1.
pag. 9. Ch. 3.
pag. 2. Ch. 4.
pag. 42. Ch. 5.
pag. 48.
(f) Chap. 5.
p. 53, 54.

wrote against the *Act* of the *General Assembly* of *Glasgow*, by which *Episcopacy* was condemn'd, has particularly declar'd himself to be no *Pleader* for the *Sole Power* of *Bishops*. He has more than once affirmed, that the *Superintendency* establish'd at the *Reformation*, was the same in *Substance* with the *Episcopacy* he pleaded for (e). But that which I shall take notice of, as sufficient for my purpose (omitting other things for brevity) is that which he has in his *Fifth Chapter* (f), where, having told how *Episcopacy* was established, *Anno 1572.* he proceeds to account, how, *Anno 1573.* certain *Limitations* of the *Power* of *Bishops* were added, which, he says, *were not very strict*, and that *no Bishop can refuse them*. Now, as he himself accounts, the *First* of those *Limitations* was, *That the Jurisdiction of Bishops in their Ecclesiastical Function, should not exceed the Jurisdiction of the Superintendents, which they had before, and continu'd to have at that time, viz. Anno 1573. which Jurisdiction, he says, was no less than that which the Bishops in his time required.* Now, it is certain, and acknowledged by all, and frequently insisted on by our *Presbyterian Brethren*, that the *Superintendents* never claim'd the *Sole Power* of either *Ordination* or *Jurisdiction*, which I desire the *Reader* here to take notice of, once for all, as that without which the true *Force* of divers of the former *Testimonies* (such as *Cowper's*, *Spotwood's*, and *Lindeſay's*) cannot be so well perceived. Go we now forward with our present *Author*: The *Second Limitation* (as he accounts) was *That the Bishops should willingly be subject to the Discipline appointed by the General Assembly, as Members thereof.* This likewise (says he) is reasonable; and no *Bishop* will think himself exempt'd from the *Censure* of a *National Assembly* lawfully constituted according to the establish'd and approv'd *Orders* of the *Church*. And the *Fifth Limitation* was, *That the Bishops should give no Collations of Benefices, without the Advice of Three qualified Ministers.* This he not only allows to be of a piece with the rest, i. e. such as no *Bishop* can refuse, but he further adds thus, *The Bishops of Scotland heretofore did astrict themselves further; for they were not accusom'd to give Collation to Benefices (except it was to Men of known Worth in the Exercise of the Ministry before), without the Advice of the whole Brethren of the Exercise (or Presbytery) where the Benefice lyes; committing the whole Tryal both of their Life and Doctrine to them, and according to their Testificate, did accept or reject him*
who

who was presented. Here, besides his fair throwing up all Pretensions to a *Sole Power*, we have a full Confirmation of what I said before (g), concerning the *Presbyteries* having the (g) § XIII. *Power of Trying Candidates for the Ministry.*

10 THE next Prelatic Advocate I am to produce, was § XXXVI. every way one of the greatest that ever pleaded the Cause; even no less a Person than KING CHARLES the MARTYR. This incomparable Prince, on all occasions, discovers his Inclinations (directed by the greatest Reason) to have been for a well temper'd Constitution of Church Government: Not at all for lodging the *Sole Power* of either *Ordination* or *Jurisdiction* in the Bishops Person, particularly in his *LIK. BAZ.* (g); having said, like an Oracle, *That not* (g) Chap. 17. *only in Religion, of which the Scripture is the best Rule, and the Churches universal Practice, the best Commentary; but also in right Reason, and the true nature of Government, it cannot be thought that an Orderly Subordination among Presbyters or Ministers, should be any more against Christianity, than it is in all Secular and Civil Governments, where Parity breeds Confusion and Faction: That he could no more believe that such Order is inconsistent with true Religion, than good Features are with Beauty, or Numbers with Harmony: And that it is not likely that God, who appointed several Orders, and a Prelacy in the Government of his Church, amongst the Jewish Priests, should abhor or forbid them among Christian Ministers, who have as much of the Principles of Schism and Division as other Men, &c.* He subjoyns thus, *Not that I am against the managing of this Presidency and Authority in one Man, by the joyn't Counsel and Consent of many Presbyters: I have offered to restore that as a fit means to avoid those Errors, Corruptions and Partialities which are incident to any one Man: Also to avoid Tyranny, which becomes no Christians, least of all, Churchmen. Besides it will be a means to take away that Burden and Odium of Affairs which may lie too heavy on one Man's shoulders; as, indeed, it did formerly on the Bishops here. What can be plainer than it is here, that his Majesty was for further limiting the Power of the English Bishops, than had been done by the former Constitutions of that Church? And yet, I hope hereafter to make it appear, that even by the Former Constitutions of that Church, the Bishops had not the Sole Power of either Jurisdiction or Ordination.* Again,

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

§ XXXVII.

(b) p. 197.
& 201.(i) Pap. 2.
p. 213.(k) Pap. 2.
p. 249, 250.

§ XXXVIII.

(l) Part I.
§ 4. Pap. 15.(m) *ibid.*
Pap. 17.

IN his *Debates* with the *Divines*, while in the *Isle of Wight*, Anno 1648. as I find them printed at the *Hague*, Anno 1657. he discourseth to the same purpose. Twice the *Divines* insist on the **SOLE POWER**, in their First Paper (b): In short, endeavouring to shew that *The Episcopal Government*, which did at first obtain in the Church, did really and substantially differ from that which the Honourable Houses of Parliament did desire the Abolition of; they make this the main, if not the only Difference, That in the primitive times they find no Vestiges of one claiming as his Right, and due to himself ALONE, as a Supreme Order and Degree, ALL POWER about Ordination of Presbyters and Deacons, and ALL JURISDICTION, &c. They have this Answer from his Majesty (i), that He thinketh it well worthy the Studies and Endeavours of Divines of both Opinions, laying aside Emulation and private Interests, to reduce Episcopacy and Presbytery into such a well proportion'd Form of Superiority and Subordination, as may best resemble the Apostolic and Primitive Times; so far forth as the different condition of the Times, and the Exigents of all considerable Circumstances will admit; so as the Power of Church Government in the particular of Ordination, which is meerly Spiritual, may remain auctoritative in the Bishop; but that Power not to be exercised without the Concurrence and Assistance of his Presbytery. — Other Powers of Government, which belong to Jurisdiction (tho' they are in the Bishop, as before is expressed), yet the outward Exercise of them may be ordered and disposed or limited by the Sovereign Power, to which, by the Laws of the place, and the acknowledgment of the Clergy, they are subordinate. To which Proposal, the Divines in their next Paper (k), do fairly refuse to give a Categorical Answer. Once more,

HIS Majesty, as appears from *Bibliotheca Regia*, printed at London, Anno 1659. at the Treaty of Uxbridg, Anno 1644. (l) offered this for one Article to the Parliament, That the Bishops shall exercise no Act of Jurisdiction or Ordination, without the Consent and Counsel of the Presbyters, who shall be chosen by the Clergy of each Diocese, out of the learnedst and gravest Ministers of that Diocese. And at the Treaty in the Isle of Wight (m), tho his Majesty would by no means consent to the Total Abolition of Episcopacy; and all that could be extorted from him, was only a Consent to the Suspension of the Exercise of it for Three Years; yet he was satisfied, that after those Three Years,

Years, Bishops should be limited to the Counsel and Assistance of Presbyters. And particularly as to Ordination, *His Majesty doth intend, and will consent, that Bishops shall not receive any into Holy Orders, without the Consent of a limited Number of Presbyters, to be chosen in such manner as shall be agreed on by his Majesty and his two Houses, for that purpose* (n). And in his *final Answer to the Parliaments Papers, concerning Church* (n) *ibid.* Pap. 18.

Government, given in by their Commissioners, on the *Eleventh and Twentieth days of November* (o); His Majesty tells (o) *ibid.* them, He is willing, *the Apostolic Bishop being preserved, that* (o) *ibid.* *all the additional Power and Jurisdiction which his Majesties Predecessors have bestowed upon that Apostolical Function, be taken away, as Archbishops, Deans, Chapters, &c. leaving nothing but what (as his Majesty believes to be proved by his Papers to their Divines) was clearly instituted by the Apostles themselves.* It had been easie to have collected more of his Majesty's Concessions and Sentiments to our present purpose; but these may be sufficient. Proceed we now to other Scottissh Advocates.

11. ANDREW LOGIE, sometime Archdeacon of Aberdeen, § XXXIX. wrote a *Vindication of Episcopacy*, and the *Nick nam'd unlawful Engagement*, Anno 1654. which was printed Anno 1660. And throughout all that little Work, he still states the Controversie (as it ought to be stated, that is) upon Parity and Imparity, never so much as once ascribing any thing like *Sole Power* to the Bishop. On the contrary, he says (p), *That the Order* (p) *pag. 5.* (of all Priests) *stands but one and the same, admitting only a Disparity of Degree in the Order; and* (q) *you are to take heed* (q) *pag. 6.* *well in this Argument, that from Æquè ad Æquale the Consequence stands inconsequent; for under the Law Sacerdotium, the Priesthood was but one and the same: They were all Æquè Sacerdotes, and yet there ceased not from hence to be a Disparity of Degree in one and the same Order; for the High Priest præ cæteris eminebat, he emin'd above the rest; and so from that Legal Oeconomy this Order may be arcessed and instructed.* And (r) (r) *pag. 7.* *why may there not be impares Gradus in Regimine, yea, and that in æquali Officio, to avoid Disorder and Confusion? Again* (s), (s) *p. 9.* *Episcopatus & Presbyteratus, stand but unus & idem Tagma, admitting only a Disparity of Degree in the Order.* Would you have more from him to this purpose? All he would have is, (t) *That One be perfected over the rest, for the Preservation of* (t) *p. 15.* *good Order, and keeping all things in a right frame, and shunning*

of

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

of Confusion, upon a confused Parity, ad culpam only, and not ad vitam, in case of Abuse of his Power to Tyranny. Indeed the same Author in another Treatise, entitled, *Rain from the Clouds, &c.* composed of Twenty Meletemata, or Meditations, has laboriously defended the *Validity* of *Presbyterial Ordinations* through his whole 17th Meletema: And yet he is very positive for the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*. However, that he was not, could not be a *Sole-Power-Man*, is so easily deducible from the account I have given of his Principles, that I need not insist on it.

§ XL.

12. THE Author of the *Seasonable Case*, published *An. 1662.* pleads for no more than a *Negative Voice* to the *Bishop*; you may see for this *pag. 11, 16, 29.* for brevity I shall only transcribe these Words from *pag. 30.* *What reason is there to bend the Covenant against the present Episcopacy of Scotland, which is established to govern the Church (not excluding, but) with the Consent of Presbyters, with as great Moderation as any was in the Primitive Episcopacy?*

§ XLI.

(u) p. 192.

13. HONYMAN, Bishop of Orkney; or, whoever was the Author of the *Second Part* of the *Survey of Naptali*, printed *Anno 1669.* is as plain as can be: He not only says (u) that the *Difference between the two (i.e. Episcopacy and Presbytery)* is like that between *Manus aperta* and *Manus clausa*; *Episcopacy is diffused in the Presbytery, but contracted in a single Bishop, yet so as to be managed with the Consent of Presbyters.* But more fully and plainly over again thus (v); *The Jurisdiction be attributed to the Church, it is nothing against us, who do not grant the Exercise of Jurisdiction to one single Person acting SOLELY, or to a Bishop EXCLUDING the Counsel and Assistance of Presbyters: As we approve well of that which is so often inculcated by antient Ignatius, in his Epistles, Let nothing be done in Church Government without, or separately from the Bishop; so we allow the Moderation of the Fourth Council of Carthage, chap. 23. Ut Episcopus nullius causam audiat absque presentia Clericorum suorum, alioqui irrita erit sententia Episcopi nisi Clericorum presentia confirmetur.* Have you not here to an *Ace* the Question stated as I stated it?

(v) p. 206.

§ XLII.

14. Bishop LEIGHTON (as I learn from the *Case of Accommodation*, written by a most zealous Presbyterian, and printed *Anno 1671.*) did most expressly disclaim all Pretences to *SOLE POWER*, in the Articles he proposed to the
Dissenting

Dissenting Brethren in the Conference at Paisley: For the Second of those Articles runs thus, *That all Church Affairs shall be managed in Presbyteries and Synods, by the free Vote of Presbyters, or the major part of them.* And the Fourth thus, *That Intrants being lawfully presented by the Patron, and duly tried by the Presbytery; there shall be a day agreed on by the Bishop and the Presbytery, for their meeting together, for their solemn Ordination and Admission* (w). And if this venerable Person was the Author of the Two Letters examined by the Author of the Case of Accommodation, he as fairly disown'd all Pretensions to SOLE POWER, as mortal Man could do it. For thus he begins his Second Letter, Sir, *The Question between us, is not concerning Bishops governing absolutely by themselves and their Delegates; but concerning Bishops governing in conjunction with Presbyters in Presbyteries and Synods.* And a little after, *If they (the Dissenting Brethren) shall say, they are not against a fixed President or Bishop — but that the Question is about their POWER; then we beg it may be so: Let that be all the Question betwixt us, and then we hope the Controversie will be quickly ended: For we trust we shall be found not at all desirous to usurp or affect an undue POWER, but rather to abate of that POWER which is reasonable, and conform even to Primitive Episcopacy, than that a Schism should continue in the Church upon that score* (x).

(w) Case of Accom. p. 2.

(x) *ibid.* p. 103.

15. Dr. BURNET is every whit as plain in his *Conferences* printed at Glasgow, Anno 1673. for he says, that according to his Notion of Episcopacy, however the Bishop may have for work, the chief Trial of all those who are to be ordained, yet the Ordinations ought not to be so performed by him as to exclude the Assistance and Concurrence of Presbyters both in the previous Tryal, and in the Ordination it self. And as for Jurisdiction, tho the Bishop hath Authority to oversee, reprove, and admonish the Clergy, yet in all Acts of publick Jurisdiction, as he ought not to proceed without their Concurrence, so neither ought they, without his Knowledge and Allowance, determine about Ecclesiastical Matters (y). Again, As for the SOLE POWER of Ordination and Jurisdiction, I am sure none among us do claim it, but willingly allow the Presbyters a Concurrence in both these (z). Again, Discover (says he to his Adversary) where the Guilt lieth, of fixing one over a Tract of Ground, who shall have the CHIEF Inspection of the Ministry, and the GREATEST Authority in Matters of Jurisdiction; so that all within that Precinct be

§ XLIII.

(y) Conf. 4. p. 310.

(z) *ibid* 320.

- governed by him with the CONCURRING VOTES of the
 (a) pag. 332. other Presbyters (a). Once more, It is a different thing to say that no Ordination nor greater Act of Jurisdiction should pass without the Bishop's Consent or Concurrence (which is all I shall pretend to, and is certainly most necessary for preserving Order and Peace) from asserting that the SOLE POWER for these stands in the
 (b) pag. 337. Bishop's Person (b).
 § XLIV. 16. THE Author of the Book entituled, *The Reformed Bishop*, printed Anno 1679. makes it his work in his 12th. Article (c), to shew, that Bishops ought to do nothing without the Concurrence of their Presbyters: He reasons for it from that Maxim, *Quod omnes tangit ab omnibus tractari debet*. He affirms, that by the common practice of the Primitive Church, Bishops did nothing without their Presbyters; And that of old, Presbyters, and many times, Deacons had Decisive Voices in Provincial Councils. He has more to this purpose in the Prosecution of his 13th. Article. And in the Conclusion of his Book (d), he says, He cannot conclude better, than with a Approbation of what King CHARLES I. has said in his ΕΙΚ. ΒΑΣ. And then transcribes from the 17th. Chapter of that admirable Book, the Words which you have above (e), Not that I am against the managing of this Presidency, &c.
 (d) pag. 299, 300.
 (e) § 36.
 § XLV. 17. THAT the Author of, *The Differences of the Times*, was no Pleader for the SOLE POWER of Bishops, is plainly enough confessed by his Adversary T. F. who tells us that the Informer (so he calls Forrester, the Author of the *Differences*, &c.) makes it compatible with Prelacy, that Presbyters should have an hand in the Government of the Church (f), as hath been already observed.
 (f) Rect. in-
 strucnd. p. 211
 § XLVI. 18. A. C. M. A. in his *Essay concerning Church Government*, out of the excellent Writings of Calvin and Beza, published Anno 1689. and digested more Geometrico, gives us this for his Third Definition: The President Bishop is he, who, from his Office, preeminent to other Ministers, is invested with a fixed Power of Ordination regulated by Canons; and of Jurisdiction ballanced by Assisting Ministers. And again, in his *Demonstration* of his Second Proposition, he has it thus, viz. that His President Bishop, the Bishop he pleads for, is invested with a Fixed Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction regulated by Canons, and ballanced by Assisting Ministers. This is so very plain, that even T. F. himself, who wrote the Counter-Essay, a Man of extraordinary
 Courage,

Courage, had not yet so much of it, as to charge him with maintaining the *Sole Power* (g).

(g) Counter-
Essay, p. 23.
§ XLVII.

19. THE Author of the *Ten Questions concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland*: In his *Resolution of the First Question*, doth so manifestly reduce the *Episcopal Power* to a *Negative Voice* over the Presbyters within his District, and allow him only a *Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction regulated by Canons, and ballanced by Assisting Presbyters*; That G. R. himself, in his *Answer* to that Book, was even forced to come to that which is indeed the *true state* of the Question, and say, that his Adversary had overlooked that which is the CHIEF, yea, the ONLY Question, on which the Controversie between the Prelatists and Presbyterians doth turn, viz. *Whether the Government of the Church should be in the hands of a single person, or a Community?* And because this was not distinct enough (as indeed it was not), he gives it over again, and much better, in these words, *Whether the Rulers of the Church ought to manage that Work in Parity; or one should manage it as Supreme, and the rest in Subordination to him?* Thus, I say, G. R. himself may remember, how One stated the Controversie, and how he counter-stated it; But of this more hereafter.

20. A. M. D. D. in his *Excellent Enquiry into the New Opinions, &c.* not only tells us, that *The First and Original Rule of Ecclesiastical Government was, that nothing was to be done without the Bishop, no, not those Acts of Ecclesiastical Power which were within the compass of the Priestly Order* (h); thereby most plainly making the *Episcopal Power* to consist in the Bishop's having a **NEGATIVE VOICE**: He not only expressly affirms, that in *antient Times, a Bishop and his Presbyters govern'd the Ecclesiastical Affairs of such a City and its Territories* (i), thereby notoriously ascribing *Governing Power* to Presbyters as well as to Bishops: He not only no where, no not so much as once ascribes the **SOLE POWER** of either *Ordination or Jurisdiction* to Bishops; but even G. R. himself, in his *Good old way defended* (k), takes notice of the Doctor's allowing to Presbyters a share of *Determining, or Decisive Power about that which must be received as the infallible Truth of God, together with the Bishops*; and from thence infers, that, by the Doctor's own Confession, *Bishops have not the SOLE AUTHORITY in the Church*. 'Tis true, G. R. says, *This might*

§ XLVIII.

(h) p. 161.

(i) p. 163.

(k) p. 10.

have been through over-sight, viz. That the Doctor allowed them any share of such Power: But certainly he had no Grounds for saying so: Neither can I see what could move G. R. to say so, unless it was that he found it convenient for his Interests to have his Reader believe, that the Doctor was an Advocate for the Sole Power of Bishops, tho' he sometimes oversaw himself, and said things inconsistent with it.

§ XLIX.

SO many *Scottish* Advocates for Episcopacy have I seen; and not so much as One of them pleading for the Bishops SOLE POWER of Ordination or Jurisdiction; not so much as One of them making that a *Bad Constitution* of a Church, by which such SOLE POWER is not lodg'd in the Bishop's Person; not so much as one of them (so far as I remember) using the Phrase of SOLE POWER in such an *impropriating* and *exclusive Sense*, unless it was (as not a few of them have done) to reject it: Nay, on the contrary, all of them, not one excepted, either in express Terms, or by easie Consequence, affirming that they pleaded only for a CHIEF POWER, &c. All of them, not one excepted, justifying and approving, and satisfying themselves with such a Constitution as that by which Presbyters are not *excluded* from having an hand both in *Acts* of Ordination and Jurisdiction. And I dare challenge G. R. to produce me so much as One *Scottish Man* that ever pleaded that the SOLE POWER of Ordination ought or should be lodg'd in the Bishop's Person; or affirmed that it was contrary to any *Divine Law*, or any Canon of any *antient Council*, or any Principle of Right Reason, or any manner of way a *bad Constitution*, by which Presbyters, in a *due Dependence* on their Bishop, are admitted to a Share of both the *aforsaid Powers*. And now, I think, I might very fairly leave it to the Reader to determine, whether G. R. had reason to make me singular in stating the Question as I stated it: Or, to say, *that I would not find many, if any one, of either side, who handled the Controversie without respect to SOLE POWER.*

§ L.

BUT perhaps when G. R. said so, he had forgot that there were ever any *Scottish* Advocates for Prelacy, and he had only the *English* in his Eye. Come we therefore next to try, whether the Learned *English* Advocates for Prelacy have all pleaded for the Bishops incommunicable Right to the SOLE POWER of Ordination and Jurisdiction. And here we enter into

into a very large Field: For the Learned *English* who have laboured in this Controversie are almost innumerable. Neither is it to be imagined, that One, in my Circumstances, can cite either all, or the greater part of them: Nor, indeed, is it necessary; for, if I can find *any One*, I have done my business against G. R. how much more, if I shall find *many*?

1. LET us begin with Archbishop *WHITGIFT* (the first *Englishman* I know, that maintain'd Episcopacy against the Presbyterians) who, in his *Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, &c.* published Anno 1574. tells us what he had said in his *Answer* to that *Admonition*, viz. that *One Prince may suffice to govern One Kingdom; and One Archbishop One Province, as Chief and Principal over the rest; One Bishop, one Diocese; One Pastor, one Parish;* fairly importing, that as the Superiority of the Prince to the Archbishop; or of the Archbishop to the Bishop, does not evacuate their respective Powers; so neither does the Superiority of the Bishop, the Power of the Parish Minister (l). And more directly in the *Defence* it self, he expressly approves S. Chrysostom in his Commentary on 1 Tim. 3. where he plainly ascribes Ruling Power to Presbyters (m). (l) p. 655. (m) p. 387. Again, we give no greater Authority to either Archbishop or Bishop, than the Consul or Prætor had among the Romans; or a Master and President in a College (n). And in another place he compares the Bishop to the Mayor of a City (o). (n) p. 396. (o) p. 398. Now I am apt to think, that G. R. himself may be induced to confess, that a Roman Consul or Prætor, or a Principal of a College, or a Mayor of a City, have not the Sole Power of Government lodg'd in their Persons. Once more, the same Great Prelat, discoursing of Excommunication (none of the most ignoble Acts of Jurisdiction) says (p), that he did never so give the Authority of Excommunication to the Bishop ALONE, but that he thought he might have other Assistance joyn'd with him, for the Execution of it, if the Order of the Church so required. (p) p. 673.

§ LL

2. Mr. HOOKER, in his Excellent Books of Ecclesiastical Policy, is every whit as favourable. He gives us the state of the Controversie in these words (q); *The Inequality which they (the Presbyterians) complain of, is, that one Minister of the word and Sacraments, should have a permanent Superiority above another; or, in any sort, a Superiority of Power Mandatory, Judicical, and Coercive over other Ministers:* By us, on the contrary

§ LII.

(q) Lib. 7.
§ 3. p. 375.
Edit. 1676.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

trary side, Inequality, even such Inequality, as unto Bishops, being Ministers of the Word and Sacraments, granteth a Superiority permanent above Ministers, yea, a permanent Superiority of Power Mandatory, Judicial, and Coercive over them, is maintain'd a thing lawful and good: For (as he goes on) one Pastor hath Superiority of Power above another, when either some are authoriz'd to do things worthier than are permitted to all; or some are preferr'd to be PRINCIPAL Agents, the rest Agents with Dependency and Subordination. And doth he not explain the matter by the Instance of the Presbyters of Ephesus, who were intrusted with the Government in Subordination to S. Paul? (r) Indeed he most plainly ascribes to the Bishop a CHIEFTY only and not a SOLITUDE of Power (as G. R. calls it) in Acts of Jurisdiction. Take his own words, Touching that other Chieftly, which is of Jurisdiction: Among the Jews, he who was Higbest, through the Worthiness of peculiar Duties incident into his Function, in the legal Service of God, did bear always in Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction the CHIEFEST SWAY.—The Ne-thenims were subordinate unto the Levites; the Levites unto the Priests; and they all unto the High-Priest, &c. (f) And then he brings all home to his purpose, by telling how S. Cyprian deem'd it no wresting of Scripture, to challenge as much for Christians Bishops, as was given to the High Priests among the Jews, and to urge the Law of Moses, as proving it most effectually: And that S. Jerom also thought it a good Argument to ground the Office of Bishops upon (t). Once more; having cited Calvin, as confessing that in the Primitive Times, he who was called Bishop, had a Power like to that of the Roman Consul; he subjoyns (u), Thus much Calvin being forced by the Evidence of Truth to grant, doth yet deny the Bishops to have been so in Authority, at the first, as to bear Rule over other Ministers: wherein, what Rule he doth mean, I know not: But if the Bishops were so far in Dignity above other Ministers, as the CONSULS of Rome, for their Year, were above other Senators, IT IS AS MUCH AS WE REQUIRE: And undoubtedly, if, as the Consuls of Rome, so the Bishops in the Church of Christ, have such Authority, as both to direct other Ministers, and to see that every one of them should observe that which THEIR COMMON CONSENT hath agreed on: How this could be done by the Bishop, not bearing Rule over them, for mine own part, I must acknowledge that my poor Conceit is not able to comprehend.

(r) *ibid.* § 5.
p. 377.

(f) p. 382.

(t) p. 383.

(u) p. 384.

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

151

3. SUTLIVIOUS, in his Book, *De Presbyterio*, not only acknowledges, that in the *Primitive Times*, Presbyters govern'd in conjunction with Bishops (v). He not only makes Presbyters, (v) Cap. 1. as well a Bishops, Successors to the Apostles; and that, as such, they have the Power of the Keys (w); but also in most express Terms, he allows of an Ecclesiastical Senate of Presbyters to assist the Bishop in Acts of Government (x). For having cited that famous Testimony of S. Jerom's, *Et nos habemus in Ecclesia Senatum nostrum*, as much insisted on by the Disciplinarians to prove the Order of Ruling Elders; and having said, that no Force of Logic could squeeze Ruling Elders out of that Testimony, he gives this reason for it, that Jerom every where makes the Ministers of the Word Elders; and in a certain place, little less than equal to Bishops. And then he adds, *Ex quibus si Senatum aliquem desideravit, minime quidem improbamus*; if S. Jerom (says he) desired to have such a Senat, a Senat compos'd of such Elders, we are not at all against it.

§ LIII.

4. Dr. DOWNAM, in his Defence of his Sermon preach'd at the Consecration of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, on *Revelat. I. 20.* (which Defence was published Anno 1611.) has many things to our present purpose. His Adversary still insisted on the SOLE POWER, and the Doctor as often rejects it, and removes it from the state of the Controversie: For instance, His Adversary had said, that it behoved the Doctor to prove, *That the Apocalyptic Angels had SOLE POWER of Ordination and Jurisdiction*: And the Doctor replies (y), *But where do I say, in all the Sermon, that the Bishops had the Sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction? Where do I deny, either that Bishops did, or might, use the Assistance of their Presbyters for either of both; or that, in defect of Bishops, both the one and the other might be perform'd by Presbyters? In a word, where do I deny all Power either of Ordination or Jurisdiction to Presbyters?* And so he goes on to tell, that there are too many Calumniation, whereby his Refuter and his Consorts did use to disgrace his Sermon, with their Followers; And one of them was, that he ascribed so, the SOLE POWER of Ordination and Jurisdiction to Bishops, as tho' the Presbyters had no Jurisdiction; or, as tho' those Churches had no lawful Ministers which have not such Ministers to ordain them. If the Reader would have more to this purpose, he may consult the Pages on the Margent (z),

§ LIV.

(y) *ibid.* p. 52,
68, 85.
parti-

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

particularly pag. 68. for there he thus, *But where, Good Sir, do I say that Bishops must have the SOLE POWER of Ordination, which you have so oft objected, and now again repeat? Make you no Conscience of publishing Untruths? Cannot Bishops be superiour to other Ministers in the Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, which is the thing which I maintain, unless they have the SOLE POWER?*

§ LV.

(a) Lib. 3.
Cap. 5. p. 110.

(b) p. 118.
(c) p. 119.

(d) p. 126.
§ LVI.

(e) Melvin
contra Tilenus,
cap. 9. § 15.
v. 10. § 8.
cap. 23. § 7.
Cald. Alt. Dum.
p. 115.

HE is as plain about *Jurisdiction* as about *Ordination*; for in his very Address to that Subject, he, thus, "Here the Reader is to observe what is by me propounded to be proved; not that the Bishops had, or have, the SOLE POWER of Jurisdiction, the Defence whereof the Refuter every where would fain force upon me; but that they are, and were, superior in the Power of Jurisdiction or Government. I deny not the Presbyters which have Charge of Souls, to have Jurisdiction, both severally in their Parishes, and joyntly in Provincial Synods (a). Then he proceeds to shew, that it was so in the Primitive Church, &c. Nay, at last he turns angry at his Adversary, for coming over and over so very frequently with his SOLE POWER; for these are his words on one Occasion, "Whence cometh this SOLE, I pray you, which hath so oft been foisted in? I fear greatly from an evil Conscience, resolved to oppugn and deface the Truth. Cannot the Bishop be superior to Presbyters in the Power of Jurisdiction, unless they have (as none have) the SOLE POWER of Jurisdiction (b)? And when his Refuter is at it again, in the next Page (c), "God amend that Soul (says the Doctor) that so often foisteth in that SOLE besides my meaning and my words. Once more, "SOLE SOVEREIGNTY! O defiled Conscience, which ceaseth not to ascribe such odious and absurd Assertions to me (d)! Indeed

SO peremptorily and zealously did this Learned Advocate remove G. R.'s Solitude of Power from the State of the Question, that both Mr. Andrew Melvin, and Mr. David Chalderwood, do acknowledg he did it, and cite him for it (e). So that it seems Blondel has not been well acquainted with Downam, who, if my Memory does not fail me, is the only Protestant Advocate whom he cites, as maintaining the Sole Power, in his Apology for S. Jerom's Opinion. But perhaps Blondel understood not the English Language, and so had not read

read Downam, but taken his Accounts of him from *Gerſom Bucer*, which may be ſome kind of Apology for him: But what Apology can be made for Mr. Forreſter, who, in his *Examination of Dr. Monro's Pleadings*, writes thus, *But as to the Episcopical Rectoral Power, the Doctor cannot be ignorant that his Fellow-Pleader, Bishop Downam, in his Defence (with whom the Doctor will not deſire to juſtle and deal Stroaks) is clear and POSITIVE in this Aſſertion of the Biſhop's SOLE AUTHORITY in Government (f)?* But I proceed:

5. BOTH the aforeſaid *Scottiſh Authors* (*Melvin* and *Calderwood*) do acknowledge as much concerning the Learned Biſhop *BILSON* (g); and juſtly: For that Great Perſon, in his Excellent Book, *De perpetua Eccleſiæ Gubernatione*, as he doth no where plead for the Biſhops incommunicable Right to the SOLE POWER of either *Ordination* or *Juriſdiction*, ſo, on the contrary, he not only ſhews himſelf abundantly ſatisfied with it; if a NEGATIVE VOICE be allowed to the Biſhop, in his *Adreſs to the Reader* (h), he not only every where acknowledges *Presbyters* to have had POWER, and to have CONCURRED with their *Biſhops* in the *Adminiſtration* of the *Government* in the *Primitive Times* (i); pleading always zealouſly for ſuch an Eſtabliſhment as obtain'd in thoſe Times; But alſo, more than once or twice, he expreſſly declares himſelf willing and ready to allow to *Presbyters* a ſhare in the *Government*, as may appear by the *Testimonies* on the *Margent* (k).

(f) p. 139.

§ LVII.

(g) Melvin,

cap. 16. § 14.

Cald. p. 267.

(h) p. 24, 25.

(i) pag. 171,

173, 174, 175,

207, 208, 210,

218, 224, 232,

234, 242, 243,

257, 276, 284,

345, 352, 354,

355, 357, 362,

398, 415.

6. Dr.

(k) In qualibet Eccleſia civitateque quæ Presbyterium ſuis ſumptibus alere poſſunt, Deus unum aliquem, vitandi diſſidii & diſcordiæ cauſa, SUPREMUM eſſe voluit, qui PASTORALI & PATRIA POTESTATE gubernaret tam Presbyteros qui ADMINISTRARI illius ſunt, quam populum qui ſubjiciuntur ei, juxta leges divinas pariter & humanas: Quarum executionem illius fidei commiſit, quia RECTOR & INSPECTOR reliquorum eſt, quem Episcopum appellamus, illius ergo quidem poteſtatem MODERATIONIS non DOMINATIONIS loco habeo, &c. p. 352.

Et p. 360. Sic paritatis vindices alloquitur, primum Episcopo jus & auctoritatem divino jure debitam concedite; deinde quosunque debetis, ei ſocios adjungite.

Et p. 362. Si de Canonica Episcoporum auctoritate conſtare, de Tyrannica facile inter nos conveniret.

Et p. 369. Conceptis hiſce verbis, omnibus quibus cura animarum commiſſa, clavium etiam pro ratâ poteſtatem concedit. Ad nos quod attinet, etſi clavium poteſtatem omnibus paſtoralem animarum curam habentibus communem eſſe, ſuo quodam modo, exiſtimemus; ad evitandas tamen infinitas Excommunicationum procellas, quæ in omnes Eccleſias parœciasque alioqui irruerent ac redundarent, & intolerandas inde lites atque pugnas neceſſario conſecuturas, ſi cuius Presbytero, pro arbitrio ſuo excommunicare liceret; Eccleſiæ Dei prudentiam in eo maximè laudamus, quod nemini inferioris alicujus loci,

excommunicandi facultatem, nisi de consensu & auctoritate Episcopi tribuerit.

Et p. 468 Quod ad presbyteros attinet—Nec locum iis, nec SUFFRAGIA in Synodis negamus quamdiu decendi aut loquendi jus in Ecclesia retinent. *Deinde referre pergit quemadmodum in Anglia presbyteri suffragiorum jure potiantur.* Itaque ad Synodos nostras, uti nostis, non Episcopi solum, sed Decani, Archidiaconi, alique Clerici, tam de presbyterio primæ & Episcopalis Ecclesiæ quam de aliis Diocesis partibus vocantur; & licet pontificii quidam SOLIS EPISCOPIS suffragia in conciliis esse contendat, quantum tamen vetus nostrarum Synodorum institutio, cum NOVA & jam nata illorum opinione discordet, ipsi videtis. Nec desunt exempla ab ultima antiquitatis memoria, quibus Ecclesiæ nostræ morem defendamus.

§ LVIII.

6. Dr. MORTON, in his *Catholick Appeal for Protestants*, in one place, reckons up *Four new and notable Deformities* (as he calls them) concerning the *Popish Constitution of Synods*: And the Second is, *That in a Synod Protestants require that it may be free, as well for Priests—as for Bishops, to have DEFINITIVE VOICES* (k). And in another place, he calls that *Popish Doctrine* which ascribes to Bishops only the Property of DEFINITIVE VOICES in a Synod, both NEW and NAUGHT (l). Was he for the Bishops SOLE POWER of Jurisdiction?

(k) Lib. 2.
Cap. 20. § 6.

(l) Lib. 4.
Cap. 19. § 3.

§ LIX.

7. Dr. FIELD is cited to this purpose, even by *Calderwood* himself (m); and reason: For this Learned Doctor is so far from attributing the SOLE POWER of Ordination to Bishops, that more than once in his *Books of the Church*, he zealously maintains the *Validity of Presbyterial Ordinations* (n), in Cases of necessity. He does not allow the Bishop, in any Case, to ordain ALONE, or without the Concurrence of Presbyters (o), unless in Cases very extraordinary. 'Tis true, he says once, that *Bishops alone have the Power of Ordination* (p); but it is plain, he means no more, than that no Man may regularly do it without them. And as for *Jurisdiction*, it is not only certain that he allows the Bishop only an EMINENT and PEERLESS POWER, and a NEGATIVE VOICE (q), but he says in so many words, *That it is most false that Bellarmine hath, viz. That Presbyters have no Power of Jurisdiction* (r). *They have* (says he) *and ought to have DECISIVE VOICES in Provincial Councils.* In short, he allows of a *Reciprocal Negative*, if I may so call it, i. e. that as Presbyters can do nothing without their Bishop, so neither ought he to do any thing without them: Take it in his own words, *We make not the Power*

(m) Alt. Dam.
p. 267.

(n) Lib. 3.
cap. 39.

Lib. 5. cap. 27,
& 56.

(o) Lib. 3.
cap. 56.

(p) ib. p. 704

(q) L. 5. c. 17.

(r) ib. p. 499.
& c. 30. p. 513
iuss.

of

of Bishops to be Princely, but Fatherly: So that, as the Presbyters may do nothing without the Bishop, so he may do nothing in Matters of greatest moment and consequence, without their Presence and Advice (f). And again, For the Government of each Diocese and (f) L. 5. c. 27 particular Church resteth PRINCIPALLY in ONE who hath an p. 499. EMINENT and PEERLESS Power, without whom nothing may be attempted or done: Yet are there OTHERS joyn'd with him, as ASSISTANTS, without whose COUNSEL, ADVICE, and CONSENT, he may do nothing of moment and consequence (t). (t) Lib. 5. Once more, The Form of Church Government is mixt in such sort, c. 30. p. 511. that in respect of a Diocese, or particular Church, there is a special Authority resting in ONE, tho' not EXCLUDING, nor neglecting, the Assistance and Concurrence of MORE (u). (u) ibid.

8. Bishop ANDREWS, in his Answer to Peter du Moulin's Second Letter, acknowledges, Churches that want Bishops, that have only Presbyters, to be true Churches (v). By fair (v) Nec tam-
Consequence he must own the Validity of Presbyterial Ordina- men si nostra
tions, and Acts of Jurisdiction. (via) divini ju-
quitur, vel quod sine ea salus non sit, vel quod stare non possit Ecclesia. Cæcus sit qui
non videat stantes sine eâ Ecclesias: Ferreus sit qui salutem iis neget, nos non sumus illi
Ferrei, &c. Vide Opusc. Posth. p. 176.

9. Dr. DAVENANT, in his Determinations, &c. printed § LXI.
at Cambridge, Anno 1639. having laid aside the Controversie, Whether Bishops and Presbyters make different Orders? as being a meer Logomachy, comes to give the true state of the main Controversie; and he gives it in these words (w), (w) Quest.
Nobis sufficit si ostendamus eos qui appropriatè vocantur Episcopi, 42. p. 187.
habere dignitatem altiore, potestatem majorem & eminentiora officia sibi annexa quam habent alii Presbyteri, i. e. It is enough if we can shew, that those who are properly called Bishops have an higher Dignity, a greater Power, and more eminent Offices annexed to them than other Presbyters. How far is this from stating it on the Sole Power? Indeed all his Arguments are level'd against PARITY. 'Tis true, he says (x), Cer- (x) p. 191.
tum est igitur potestatem ordinandi ex officio, SOLIS EPISCOPIS convenire: And Censuram tamen (excommunicationis) ab Episcopali TANTUM Autoritate produisse (nempe apud veteres) & tanquam actum Episcopalis Jurisdictionis transisse, &c. (y) And therefore Excommunication was called (y) p. 192.
Episcopalis mucro; such words, I say, I grant he has used: But

it is plain to any Man who reads him, that he meant no more, than that the CHIEF Power in Ordination and Excommunication belonged to the Bishop: That he did not mean a SOLE Power, in an exclusive sense: He did not mean, that such Power belonged to incommunicably to the Bishop; as that none but he could exercise it, or be admitted to a share of it: For, besides that he lived and dyed a Bishop in England, where, by the Constitution (as I shall shew) Presbyters concur in both Powers: Besides this, I say, he peremptorily owns and asserts the Validity of Presbyterian Ordinations, such as they have in the Transmarine Protestant Churches (z). And he commends the Piety of the Antient Bishops, who, in Acts of Government, did nothing without their Presbyters (a); and affirms, that Bishops have not a Regal or Despotic Power, but only a Pastoral and Paternal one over their Clergy.

(z) p. 191.

(a) p. 192.

§ LXII.

This is transcribed as the sense of a great Party in England, by the Author of The Principles and Practices of certain moderate Divines, &c.

Part 3. § 111. p. 323, 34.

§ LXIII. (b) supra § (c) sup. § 24.

§ LXIV.

§ LXV.

(d) supra § XVIII.

(e) sect. 5.

THE excellent Mr. CHILLINGWORTH, in his Demonstration of the Apostolic Institution of Episcopacy, begins it thus; "If we abstract from Episcopal Government all Accidents, and consider only what is essential and necessary to it, we shall find in it no more but this: An Appointment of one Man of eminent Sanctity and Sufficiency, to have the Care of all the Churches within a certain Precinct or Diocese, and furnishing him with Authority NOT ABSOLUTE and ARBITRARY, but regulated and bounded by Laws, and MODERATED, by joyning to him a convenient Number of ASSISTANTS, &c.

11. Archbishop USHER's Scheme is so well known, and he is so plainly confessed, not only by Mr. Forrester (b), but even by G. R. himself (c), to have been no Pleader for SOLE POWER, that it is needless to adduce his words.

12. Dr. HOLDSWORTH was of the same Judgment with Usher, and subscribed to his Scheme.

13. Dr. JOSEPH HALL doth always disclaim SOLE POWER in the plainest Terms imaginable. T. F. confesses so much of him, as we have heard (d). But let us hear himself: Thus, when Smectymnius in their Answer to the Humble Remonstrance insisted much on it, he told them in his Defence of that Remonstrance, that they spake enviously and untruly, when they said, that the English Bishops appropriated the Power of Ordination to themselves (e). And, For this main Point (says he, viz. the Power of Ordination), let mine

Adver.

Adversaries know, that the **ORDINATION** is the Bishops; but the **SOLE** (in their Sense) is their own. Neither did our Bishops ever challenge it as theirs **ALONE**, without the Presbyters, but as **PRINCIPALLY** theirs with them; so, as if the **POWER** be in the Bishop, the **ASSISTANCE** is from **THEM**, the **PRACTICE** in **BOTH**. So it is in the Bishops, that ordinarily and regularly it may not be done without them; and yet, ordinately, it may not be done without **THEM** by the Bishop: Which hath been so carefully and constantly ever observed, that I challenge them (the Smeectymnuans) to shew any one Instance in the Church of England to the contrary: Say, Brethren, I beseech you, after all this noise, what Bishop ever took upon him to Ordain a Presbyter **ALONE**, without the concurrent imposition of many Hands (f)?

(f) Sect. 8.

§ LXVI.

AND as for Jurisdiction, he is every whit as plain. Take his words, "You will needs beat the Air very furiously, and fight pitifully with your selves. Alas! Brethren, why will you take so much pains to go wilfully out of the way, and to mislead the Reader with you? Who ever challenged (in that Sense you feign to your selves) a **SOLE JURISDICTION**? Why will you, with some shew of Learning, confute that which you yield us to confess? We confess this **SOLE** cryed down by store of Antiquity. We do willingly grant, that Presbyters have, and ought to have, and exercise a Jurisdiction within their own Charge, in *foro conscientiae*. We grant, that in all the great Affairs of the Church, the Presbyters, whether in Synods, or otherwise, ought to be consulted with. We grant, that of old; the Bishops had their Ecclesiastical Council of Presbyters, with whose Advice they were wont to manage the greatest matters. And we still have so (for to that purpose serve the Deans and Chapters). And the Laws of our Church frequently make that use of them. We grant that Presbyters have their **VOICE** in Provincial Synods: But we justly say, that the **SUPERIORITY** of Jurisdiction is so in the Bishop, as that Presbyters neither did, nor may exercise without him: And that the Exercise of external Jurisdiction is derived from, by, under him, to those which execute within his Diocese (g). And a little after, For (g) Sect. 9. my part I perswade my self, that the more frequent Communicating of all important Business of the Church, whether

" Cen-

"Censures, or Determinations, with those grave Assistants,
 "which, in the Eye of the Law, are design'd to this purpose,
 "were a thing not only unprejudicial to the Honour of our
 "Function, but very behoveful to the happy Administration
 "of the Church.

§ LXVII. WOULD you have more of him? Then turn to *Sect. 14.* where he turns pretty pleasant with *Smectymnus*, for insisting so constantly and confidently on this matter of the **SOLE POWER**. You still talk of **SOLE ORDINATION** and **SOLE JURISDICTION**: You may, if you please, keep that **PAIR** of **SOLES** for your next *Shoes*: We contend not for such an height of Propriety, neither do we practise it. They are so ours, that they should not be without us. And in his Answer to the Epistle prefix'd to the *Vindication of Smectymnus*, he says, That Bishops neither may nor do challenge to themselves such a **SOLE Interest in Ordination or Jurisdiction**, as utterly to **EXCLUDE** Presbyters from some Participation in this Charge and Act. And, **SOLE ORDINATION** and **SOLE JURISDICTION** we so disclaim, as that we hold the Power of both, **PRIMARILY**, in the Bishop the **CONCURRENT ASSISTANCE** in the Presbyters: What Opposition can there be in an orderly Subordination? And it is considerable that he says (*ibid.*) viz. that in all this, he had not departed one inch from the received Judgment of English Orthodox Divines. So that we have not only his own Sentiment, but, if we may trust him (and I see no reason why we should not) the universal Sense of all the true Sons of the Church of England in his time, viz. that they were no Pleaders for the Bishops **SOLE POWER** of either Ordination or Jurisdiction. Whoso pleases, may see more to this purpose in this eloquent Bishop's Book, called, *The Peace-Maker*; in which he is so pat for allowing to Presbyters a share in the Government, that Mr. Baxter has transcribed plentifully from it, to that effect, in his *Disputations about Church Government* (h).

(h) p. 340,
 Ec.

§ LXVIII. 14. Mr. BAYLIE, as G. R. tells us, was the Author of *The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Episcopacy*, and of the *Defence* of it, published Anno 1641. And, if we may believe Mr. Baylie, the Author, whoever he was, against whom he wrote his *Defence*, was no **SOLE-POWER-Man**; for Baylie thus accosts him (i), *How marvellously do you shift and extenuate the Question? The Author's* (i.e. Baylie's) *Principle did*
 speak

(i) p. 12.

Speak expressly and solely of a distinct Office in the Church of God: You dare not say whether Episcopacy be any such thing or not: All the distinction between a Bishop and a Presbyter that you speak of, is a higher and a lower Degree, as it were, of the same Office: Your Brethren will give you small Thanks for this Extenuation. It seems it is no new thing, no ways peculiar to T.F. or G.R. to be angry when Prelatists state the Question otherwise than they would have it done. No, 'tis apparent they have herein only followed the Foot-steps of their Fathers. But that which is more proper to be observed here, is, how G.R. notwithstanding his acquaintance with this Book of Baylie's, in which, one Advocate for Prelacy is chastised, for disclaiming SOLE POWER, has had the confidence to say, *I would not find many, if any one, &c.* But now that I think on it, there may be this Apology made for him, (such as it is) that it is unreasonable to require of him that he should remember better what Mr. Baylie, than what himself has written. I proceed.

15. I have seen a Book entituled *VELITATIONES* § LXIX. *POLEMICÆ*, printed at London, Anno 1652. in which Twelve Questions are ventilated; the Second whereof is, Of Prelacy in Church Government. In the management of which Controversie, the Author not only defines Prelatic Authority to be Authority in CHIEF, above the rest of the Presbytery (k), (k) § 1. but all along he disputes only for CHIEF, never for SOLE POWER, e.g. his First Argument is this, That Power in the Church which Timothy and Titus did exercise by the Apostles special appointment, is certainly of Apostolic Institution: But Prelatic Power, or Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction in CHIEF, Timothy and Titus did exercise; Ergo (l), His Second Argument runs thus, Such Power as the immediate Successors of the Apostles, Men learned and godly, did generally both assert and practise is doubtless of Apostolic Institution: But Prelatic Power, or a Power of ONE ABOVE the rest, the immediate Successors of the Apostles — did generally practise; Ergo (m). His Fourth (m) § 17. Argument is (n), that Prelatic Government, or the Government (n) § 36. of ONE IN CHIEF makes most for the preventing or composing of Church Differences. And his Fifth, that The Government of the Church by Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, cometh nearest to the Proto-Type, or first Pattern of God's own framing (o). In (o) § 40. short, he says expressly, that what he has argued is in Defence of

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

of Prelatical Government, or Church Government by ONE in CHIEF; and that it is not to be understood, as spoken of a Monarchical Exercise of Government, (i.e. not of SOLE POWER; for 'tis plain, he takes the word Monarchical in the Exclusive Sense), but that all he aim'd at was, the Defence of the precisely and truly Primitive Authority, maintain'd thus, and to this height, in every particular, long since by that worthy Instrument of the Churches Reformation, Martin Bucer, de Regno Christi, Lib. 2. Chap. 12. And I think that no Man who is acquainted with Bucer, will say, that he was for lodging the Sole Power in the Bishop's Person (p).

(p) § 43.
§ LXX.

(q) Lib. 3.
cap. 16. p. 145.
Edit. Lond.
1659.

(r) p. 151.

(f) p. 126.
Edit. London.
1670.

(t) p. 197.

16. Mr. THORNDIKE, as Learned a Man as many, and as resolute an Asserter of the Divine Right of Episcopacy as any, is so far from being an Advocate for the Bishop's SOLE POWER, that on the contrary, he has on all occasions most zealously declared against it; particularly, whoso pleases, may turn to his *Primitive Government of Churches*, and he will find the whole Design of his Seventh Chapter, is, to assert the *Governing Power of Presbyters*, and reject the *Solitude of Power in Bishops*. And in his *Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England* (q), he tells us that, *By the appointment of the Apostles, the Bodies of Christians contain'd in each City, and the Territories thereof, is to constitute a several Church to be GOVERNED by ONE CHIEF RULER, called a Bishop, with PRESBYTERS, or Priests, SUBORDINATE to him for his ADVICE and ASSISTANCE, and Deacons to minister and execute their Appointment*. And again (r), *I allow the Name of Bishops* (says he), *in the Apostolic Writings, to comprehend Priests also, because of the matter of their Function common to both, tho' with a CHIEF Power in the Bishop, in Priests so LIMITED, as to do nothing without his Consent and Allowance*. Whoso desires more, may find as much as may make up a Volume to this purpose in his Writings, particularly in his *Rights of the Church in a Christian State*; in his *Just Weights and Measures*; and in his *Discourse of the Forbearance, or the Penalties which a due Reformation requires*; where (f) he challenges no more Power, as due to the Bishop, than a **NEGATIVE VOICE**, the Prerogative that **NOTHING BE DONE WITHOUT HIM**. To conclude, Mr. Baxter himself, in his *Disputations on Church Government* (t), acknowledges, that Thorndike was for a *Regulated Episcopacy*.

17. THE

17. THE accurate (I do not say, the, in every thing, § LXXI. found) Author of the *Brief Account of Antient Church Government*, printed at London, Anno 1662. in his Fourth Part, has a whole Chapter (the Second) of Concessions made to the Presbyterians, for removing By-Quarrels. And among the rest, these (u), That all that enter into the Sacred Order (u) p. 160. of Priesthood, have some Charge of Christ's Flock, and some § 101. n. 1. Government of the Church committed to them, as well as Bishops; though in Subordination to them, and Dependence on their Licence for the Exercise of this Power (received in Ordination) upon such and such Subjects (yet not such a Dependence this, neither, but that many of those Acts become valid, when done, though done without a Licence); So, the Presbyters do teach, exhort, rebuke, catechise, examin Mens Consciences, take Confessions, do bind and impose Penitences and Satisfactions, suspend from Absolution, and the Sacraments, absolve and reconcile Penitents; and thus exercise a Supreme Jurisdiction of binding and loosing, accountable to none but God in Foro interno, or Conscientiæ, though not in Foro externo, or Contentioso, which belongs to the Bishop. Then he cites and approves what we have already transcribed from Bishop Hall (v); (v) supra, and he insists on some antient Authorities to the same purpose. § 66. But he goes on (w), Let it be conceded likewise, that (w) p. 163. Presbyters were joyned also with the Bishop, in several Acts of § 102. n. 1. this Ecclesiastical Government, as his Assistants, Assessors, Council, and FELLOW VOTERS in Diocesan Synods; so that these Acts were not ordinarily transacted by the Bishop, without the Knowledge and CONSENT of his College of Presbyters—This is acknowledged to have been antiently observed.—Then having cited Ignatius, Cyprian, Cornelius, to this purpose, he transcribes from Bishop Hall, concerning Ordination, what you have above (x), and from Dr. Hammond these words (x) § 66. concerning the Second Canon of 4. Conc. Carth. This Canon is a Testimony of the Fitness and Usefulness of that Custom still retained and used in our Church in all Ordinations of Presbyters and Deacons, that the Presbyters present should lay on their Hands, by the Hand of the Bishop, and so joyn in the Prayer of Benediction. This, this Author grants, upon condition you'll grant to him the following reasonable Provisions, which are 1. That such Arguments, touching Bishops not governing

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

without their Presbytery in former times, have no more force now, for equalling Bishops with Presbyters, than they had then:
 2. That this Right be still preserv'd to the Prelats; that nothing be done by the Presbyters without the Bishop. And
 3. That there be affirmed no absolute necessity of such Concurrence of the Presbytery, especially as to Ordination, &c. These I call Reasonable Provisions, especially the last; and I hope our Presbyterian Brethren will not deny but that, according to their own Principles, in Cases of necessity, One single Presbyter may ordain a Presbyter. These things, and many more, has this Author, from which I think it is easie to collect, that he was not for lodging the SOLE POWER incommunicably in the Bishop's Person.

& LXXII.

18. Dr. ISAAC BARROW, in an excellent Sermon on Heb. 13. 17. discourses thus, *The Church is acies ordinata, a well marshalled Army, wherein, under the Captain-General of our Faith and Salvation (the Head of the Body, &c.) there are divers Captains, serving in Degrees of Subordination; Bishops commanding larger Regiments, Presbyters ordering less numerous Companies; all which, by the Bands of common Faith, of mutual Charity, of holy Communion and Peace, being combin'd together, do, in their respective Stations, GOVERN and guide, are governed and guided; the Bishops, each in his Precinct, guiding more immediately the Priests subject to them; the Priests, each guiding the People committed to his charge, &c. (y).* And in his admirable Treatise Of the Pope's Supremacy, (a Treatise in which he has subverted that Bishop's Pretensions to be Head of the Catholick Church, solidly, copiously, convincingly, unanswerably) he tells us, that *At first, each Church was settled apart, under its own Bishops and PRESBYTERS (z); And, That every Bishop, as a Prince, in his own Church, did act freely, according to his Will and Discretion (i. e. without all Dependence on any Superiour) with the Advice of his Ecclesiastical Synod, i. e. his College of Presbyters. In short, by his Principles, Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles. And he tells us (a), That the Apostles founded Societies, ordained Pastors, fram'd Rules and Orders for the Edification and good Government of Churches, reserving to themselves only a kind of paramount Inspection and Jurisdiction over them, which in effect was only a paternal Care*
 over

(y) Vol. 3.
 Sermon. 24. pag.
 271.

(z) p. 162.
 Edit. fol. Lond.
 1683.

(a) *ibid.*
 p. 48, 49.

over them: From which it follows by plain and easie consequence, that by his Principles, Bishops, who are the Apostles Successors, have only a **PARAMOUNT Inspection and Jurisdiction** over Presbyters, but not the **SOLE POWER** of Jurisdiction.

19. Dr. **STILLINGFLEET**, in his *Unreasonableness* § LXXIII. of Separation, has pretty fully managed this Controversie, concerning the *True State* of the *Main Controversie*. He chastises Mr. Baxter, for having his recourse to the **SOLE POWER** (b). He tells him, *He runs upon this perpetual* (b) Part 2. *Mistake, that the English Episcopacy is not a Succession to the* § XI. p. 265. *ordinary part of the Apostolical Power in Governing Churches; but a new sort of Episcopacy, not heard of in the Antient Church, which SWALLOWS UP THE WHOLE POWER OF PRESBYTERY, and leaves them only a bare Name of Curates, &c.* Then he applies himself to demonstrate, with the greatest Evidence of Reason, that by the *English Constitution*, the *Diocesan Bishop* has neither the **SOLE POWER** of Ordination, nor of *Jurisdiction* (c). In short, he did (c) Sect. 12. so clearly, so fully, and so convincingly shew this, that *per tot.* G. R. (this same G. R. who said I would not find *Many*, if any One, &c.) in his *Rational Defence of Nonconformity*, written against the same Book of the same Dr. Stillingfleet, was forced to come to this (d), *That the Presbyterians do* (d) Part 3. *not alledge: that the English Episcopacy taketh away THE* Sect. IV. § XI. *WHOLE POWER* of Presbyters; for that (says he) *were to reduce them into the same Order with the rest of the People: But we say* (so he continues) *it usurpeth an undue Power over them, that neither Christ, nor the Primitive Church ever allowed, in taking out of their hand that Power of governing the Church that they have EQUAL with the Bishop.* So G. R. I say, in so many words, fairly quits the *Plea* of the **SOLE POWER**, and betakes himself to **PARITY**, which (as I shall shew hereafter) is indeed the *true State* of the Controversie. I shall say no more at present, than that one may be apt to apprehend that G. R. might as readily have forgotten his own Name, as that Dr. *Stillingfleet* was ONE who did not allow the Controversie to be stated on the Bishop's **SOLE POWER**.

§ LXXIV.

20. Dr. SHERLOCK, in his *Defence of Dr. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation*, printed Anno 1681. states the Controversie as it ought to be stated, thus, *Whether Christ and his Apostles instituted a PARITY or IMPARITY of Officers in the Church? Whether Bishops and Presbyters be equal? Or whether Bishops have a Superiour Power, Office, Order, or Degree, call it what you please, over Presbyters (e)?* And this he calls the *Great Question*. And how frequently does he allow a *Subordinate Power to Presbyters*? For instance, Mr. Baxter having asked if there were no more Churches in the World, in the Apostles time, but Twelve or Thirteen (*i. e.* as many as there were Apostles) that had governing Pastors? The Doctor answers (*f*), *Yes, they had all governing Pastors, as our Churches have now, besides the Bishops; but the supreme governing Power was in their own (the Apostles) hand.* In another place (*g*), he says, *We may easily observe in antient Writers, who acknowledg the Episcopal Prebeminence, that they used to denote the Governours of the Church by some common Name: For though the Authority of Bishops and Presbyters is very different, yet they BOTH have Authority in the Church; and therefore when the Antients were not concerned to distinguish the different Degrees of POWER, they included them both in one common Name, as Joyn't Governours of the Church.* Who so is desirous to have more to this purpose, may consult pag. 261, 271, 327, 361, 422, 424, 584.

§ LXXV.

21. Dr. PARKER, sometime Bishop of Oxford, one who (as appears from his Writings) seems to have had very just Notions about the *Government and intrinsic Power of the Church*, in his Book entituled, *Religion and Loyalty* (*h*), gives us this account of the *Primitive Church Government*, "That every Diocese was a distinct Society of it self, and ordinarily governed by a Jurisdiction within it self; and that was by the Bishop and College of Presbyters, in which he enjoyed such a Supremacy, that no Act of the Presbyters could be valid without his Consent and Authority; and yet his Supremacy was so confin'd, that he could as little act without the Concurrence of his Presbyters, as they without his. And then he subjoyns his hearty Approbation of such a Constitution, saying, that

This

(*h*) Part 1.

§ XI. p. 181, 182.

See more to this purpose in his Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the first 600 years.

§ XI. p. 128, &c. Nay frequently in that Book.

This Episcopal Superiority acting only in conjunction with the Presbyters, was the most proper Method that could have been contrived to prevent Confusion on the one hand, and Tyranny on the other.

22. Dr. PEARSON, the Great Bishop of Chester, as § LXXVI. he nowhere pleads for the SOLE POWER of Bishops, so he frequently acknowledges, that in the *Primitive Times* Bishops did not *claim* it; and that the Apostles put them only in possession of a Superiority of Power, &c. setting them over Presbyters, not intirely to *deprive* them of *all* Power, but to *moderate* their Power, and make it useful, by keeping it within due bounds, for *preventing* of the *Confusions* that might arise from *Parity* (1). And particularly, he gives an account of the Powers which were *lodg'd* in the Persons of *Timothy* and *Titus*; affirming, that there was nothing unreasonable in it; that the Apostles should have first planted Presbyters, as *Governours* of the Churches, and afterwards set Bishops over them, with a Superiority of Power, not *destructive* of the Power of Presbyters, but *paramount* unto it (k). You have his words on the Margin.

(i) Quippe ex ipsis S. Pauli Epistolis id quod à nostris asseritur liquidò constat; nempe in particularibus Ecclesiis singulares aliquos & speciales viros

præpositos fuisse omnibus presbyteris inter se æqualibus cum Jurisdictione supra illos presbyteros prius ordinatos; illosque singulares & speciales viros ab ipso Apostolo Paulo iis Presbyteris quos ipse PARI cum POTESTATE instituerat, cum MAJORE & EXORTI POTESTATE superimpositos fuisse. De successione primorum Romæ Episcoporum Dissert. I. cap. 9. § 4. p. 74.

(k) Neque vero fuit hæc mutatio regiminis ab Apostolis primò instituti, quam adeo incredibilem esse vult Salmasius, sed tantum ejusdem Regiminis adimpletio qua Ecclesia ab Apostolo primum fundata, & ministris sub Apostolo administrata, addito tamen singulari & speciali viro membris suis jam completa & numeris omnibus absoluta evaderet, *ibid.* § 9.

IF these 22. are not enough to absolve me from the § LXXVII. Crime of Singularity in stating the main Question, then G. R. and his Brethren may turn

23. To Archbishop BANCROFT's Survey of the pretended holy Discipline, p. 105. Edit. 1593.

24. To Bishop FEWEL, as cited by the Provincial Assembly of London, in their often cited Appendix to *Jus Divinum Ministerii*, &c. p. 146. and (if that does not satisfy) his Apology, of the English Edition, Anno 1685. pag. 21. may be consulted.

25. Dr.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

25. Dr. FULK's *Annotations on Tit. l. 3.*
26. Dr. WILLET's *Synopsis Papism. Cont. Gen. 5. Quest. 3.*
27. SARA VIA, cited even by Blondel himself, for the Validity of Presbyterian Ordinations, *Apol. pro Sent. Hieron.* p. 354, 355. And indeed he is not injurious to him.
28. Bishop ALLEY.
29. Bishop PILKINTON.
30. Bishop BRIDGES; all Three cited for the Validity of those Ordinations, by the Provincial Assembly of London, as above, viz. p. 146.
31. Sir FRANCIS BACON, largely cited against SOLE POWER, even by Calderwood, *Alt. Dam.* p. 310, 311, 312.
32. Mr. MASON, cited both by Blondel, p. 288. And the Provincial Assembly of London, as above p. 127, 132, 146.
33. DANIEL TILENUS, in his *Paraclesis ad Scotos Disciplinæ Genevensis Zelotas*, p. 11. & 34.
34. Mr. MEDE, in his *Discourse on 1 Cor. 4. 1.*
35. THEOPHILUS ISCANUS, as cited both by Blondel, p. 163. and Lewis du Moulin, in his *Apologia pro Epistola ad Renatum veridæum*, p. 122.
36. Dr. FEARN, in his Book entitled *Episcopacy and Presbytery considered*, p. 3, 13, 14, 15. Edit. Lond. 1647.
37. Dr. PRIDEAUX, in his *Fasciculus Controversiarum*, printed at Oxford, Anno 1649. p. 204, 212, 214, 216.
38. Dr. NOWEL, cited by Provincial Acts of London, as above, p. 146.
39. The Author of the *Confessions of Protestant Divines, and their Proofs, That Episcopacy is, in respect of the Office, according to the word of God, &c.* Thes. 4. p. 9. Edit. 1662.
40. Dr. DUREL, in his *View of the Government and publick Worship of God, in the Reformed Churches, &c.* p. 7. & 86. Edit. Lond. 1662.
41. The Author of the *English and Scotch Presbytery*, printed at London, Anno 1660. p. 157, 158.
42. Dr. CAVE's *Dissertation concerning the Government of the Antient Church*, Lond. 1683. p. 33, 34, 38.
43. Dr. TOWERSON, on the Creed, pag. 303. Edit. Anno 1685.

44. Dr. PIERCE, his *Pacificatorium*, Edit. Lond. 1685. cap. 24. § 7, 9, 11.

45. Mr. KETTLEWELL, in his *Communion to be kept on*, part. 3. p. 6.

46. The Author of the Book, entituled, the *Unity of the Priesthood*, § 3.

I HAVE likewise seen other Four, whom I must consider a little more fully, because they are commonly supposed to have carried the Episcopal Power to the greatest Heights: So that if it can be made appear, that they were no SOLE-POWER-MEN, that they were very far from condemning such a Constitution of a Church, as, by which, Presbyters are allowed an *Interest* in both *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*; so far from condemning it, that in express terms they approve it, and assert the *Conveniency*, as well as the *Lawfulness* of it; if this, I say, can be made appear, I think I may fairly be allowed to forbear to cite any more Authors. The First is

§ LXXVII.

ANTONIUS DE DOMINIS, who, tho' perhaps he may somewhere affirm, that *all Power* was *originally* in the *Bishops*; yet elsewhere he most expressly allows of a *Reciprocal Negative Voice*, that is, that as the Presbyters can do nothing without the Bishop, so neither ought the Bishop to do *any thing* in matters of Weight and Consequence, without his Presbyters. Nay, he fairly makes this of Divine Appointment; you have his words in the Margent (l); words so plain, that even *Calderwood* himself, in his *Alitare Damascenum* (m), takes notice of them, and transcribes them, and says, that *Spalatenfis* was *no Enemy to the Power of Presbyters*. And again, he cites more from him to the same purpose (n). The Reader who is curious for further satisfaction, may turn to *Spalatenfis de Rep. Eccl. lib. 5. cap. 3.* where he may have enough of it.

§ LXXIX.

(l) Acquiem-
admodum
presbyteri ni-
hil possunt si-
ne Episcopo,
circa regimen
Ecclesiæ, ita
neque, vice
versa, Episco-
pos DECET
sine suis pres-

byteris, suas Ecclesias, presertim in gravioribus negotiis, gubernare, quamvis enim Episcopus suam jure Divino habeat supra Presbyteros prælationem, illi tamen eodem jure Divino sunt in Ministeriis essentialibus, sui Episcopi socii & collegæ. *Lib. 2. cap. 9. num. 4.*

(m) *Alt. Dam. p. 276.*

(n) Cum itaque jure Divino & ipsi (presbyteri) suam habeant potestatem, errant quicunque presbyteros parochos meros faciunt ministros Episcoporum, qui tamen PROPRIAM & ORDINARIAM, & NON DELEGATAM, ut constat, habent POTESTATEM. *Spalat. lib. 2. cap. 9. num. 9. cit. Alt. Dam. p. 211.*

§ LXXX.

(o) § 21.
p. 162. Edit.
Lond. 1657.
(p) *ibid.*
p. 132.

Dr. TAYLOR, the Second of the Four, is as little for making the Power of either Ordination or Jurisdiction incommunicable, as any other Prelatist. For tho' his Scheme does indeed lodge the SOLE Power originally in the Bishop; (his Hypothesis being that Bishops, only, and Deacons are of Divine Institution, and that Presbyters were afterwards ordain'd, and assumed in partem sollicitudinis, into a share of the Trouble, by the Bishops, when Christians turn'd numerous); yet he no where pleads, that this SOLE POWER should continue to be always exercised by the Bishops: On the contrary, these are his very words in his *Episcopacy asserted* (o), *That Bishops are not tied to exercise Jurisdiction solely in their own Persons.* In short (p), he founds the Order of Presbyters in the 72 Disciples, and tells us, *That these 72 the Apostles did admit in partem sollicitudinis, and by new Ordination or Delegation Apostolical, did give them Power of administering Sacraments, of Absolving Sinners, of governing the Church in conjunction with and Subordination to the Apostles, of which they had a Capacity by Christ's calling them, at first, in sortem Ministerii; but the exercise and attuating of this Capacity, they had from the Apostles: So that, not by Divine Ordination, or immediate Commission from Christ, but by Derivation from the Apostles (and therefore in Minority and Subordination to them) the Presbyter did exercise Acts of Order and Jurisdiction, in the absence of the Apostles, or Bishops, or in conjunction conciliary, and by way of Advice, before the Consecration of a Bishop to a particular Church, and all this he doubts not was done by the direction of the Holy Ghost.* It were easie to cite much more to this purpose from that Book, and his other Writings. But that which I have adduced is enough; for it makes it as clear as Light, that he pleaded not for the incommunicability of the Power of either Ordination or Jurisdiction; that he ask'd no more, than that Presbyters should exercise those Powers in conjunction with, and Subordination to their Bishop.

§ LXXXI.

Dr. HAMMOND, a very Great Man, an Antiquary very accurate (much more accurate than Dr. Taylor); an Advocate for Prelacy, beyond the ordinary size, both for Industry and Comprehension; and one whose Writings on this Controversie have made him very famous, is another who

who is commonly reckon'd to have rais'd the Episcopal Power to a very high pitch. His *Hypothesis* is indeed so far the same with *Taylor's*, that he asserts *Bishops* only and *Deacons* to be of *prime Institution*, and it was after *Christians* were numerous, that the Order of *Presbyters* was introduced, that they might be *Sharers* of the *Burthen*, and *Affistants* to the *Bishop*. But neither was he for lodging the *Power* of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction* incommunicably in the *Bishop's* Person. On the contrary, in his *Fourth Dissertation* against *Blondel* (q), he tells us, that *The fairest* (q) cap. 9. *Representation of the Constitution of the Government of Chri-* § 5. *stian Churches, we can have, is to be found in the Old Testa-* ment, i. e. as *Moses* at first instituted only *Twelve Princes* to be over the *Twelve Tribes*, with *Lictors* or *Servants* to attend them; so our *Saviour* at first instituted the *Twelve Apostles*: And as, afterwards, there was a *Consistory* of *Seventy Col-* leagues adjoyned to *Moses*, and of *Twenty Three* to each of the *Princes*, to be *Sharers* with them of the *Burthen* and *Troubles* of the *Government*; so, when *Christians* became numerous, a *Col-* lege of *Presbyters* was erected and adjoyned to the *Bishop*, who were assumed in *partem officii onerisque*, into a share of the *Office* and *Burthen*. So that the very reason of the *Institution* of the Order of *Presbyters* was that they might be *GOVER-* *NOURS*, tho in *Subordination* to the *Bishop*: Neither has he any where retracted, but every where justified this Scheme. He justifies it, I say, both in his *Vindication* of his *Dissertations* from the *Answers* and *Exceptions* offered against them by the *London Ministers*; and in his *Answer* to *Dr. Owen's Animadversions* on them. Indeed,

IN this last named Book, tho he says (r), he cannot § LXXXII. find clear Evidence that such Officers as we now call *Pres-* (r) cap. 5. byters, were ordained in the Times of the *Apostles*, unless Sect. 3. § 19. it was the *Apostle S. John*; yet he doubts not to call that Order of *Apostolic Institution*. The reason (says he) why they were not at first instituted, as well as *Deacons*, being but this, because there was no need of them yet; and the *Power* given by the *Apostles* to the first *Bishops*, being a *plenary Power*, so far, that they might communicate to others what was committed to them, either in whole or in part; and those *Bishops*, accordingly, in the force thereof constituting *Presbyters* in *partem*

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

officii, the Authority, still, by which they were instituted will be Apostolical. Now, if by Dr. Hammond's Principles, Presbyters, by as good as Apostolical Institution, were ordained to be Sharers with Bishops, of the Burden of the Government, I think 'tis pretty clear that he did not, could not, condemn a Constitution whereby Presbyters are now-a-days admitted to a share of such a Burden. But this is not all: For, indeed,

§ LXXXIII. HE, in his Answer to Dr. Owen's Animadversions (s), describes Presbyters after this manner, *That they may be most distinctly stiled Presbyteri Secundarii, or Partiarri, Elders of a Second Rank, admitted to the Exercise of some parts of the Episcopal Office, but not to all, and so distinguished from Bishops or Elders of the first Rank.* Now, I think, those who are admitted to some Parts of the Episcopal Office, are not intirely excluded from it.

§ LXXXIV. THE same Dr. H. proceeding on the same Principles, in his Introduction to his Vindication, &c. against the London Ministers (t), says expressly, that Presbyters, by their Institution, are placed in a Second Rank, as of DIGNITY, so of POWER; only, they have never all that Power committed to them which was committed to the Bishops. And in the Vindication it self, he calls them (u), Inferiour Officers, ordained that that part of the Bishop's Task (which could not be performed by the Bishops) might be performed by them; as when the whole Burden, which was too heavy for Moses, was distributed among other Men. And again, giving his Judgment of that Nicety (as he justly calls it) that is gotten into the Schools, that Bishops and Presbyters do not make different Orders, but different Degrees of the same Order, he says, *It is of little Importance which way the Question is decided, as long as the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters is agreed on to be such as bath some Powers reserved to the One which are not common to the Other.* Some Powers, says he, not ALL POWERS, by consequence, not SOLE POWER (v). And in his Answer to Dr. Owen's Animadversions (w), he thus describes the Form of Government he pleads for; *One Bishop, with his College of Presbyters under him, and one, or more Deacons of a Third Rank, RULING and Administring, in their severall Places and Offices, the Affairs of any one particular*

particular Church. And again, that which the Prelatists pretend to, and plead for, is, *A Subordination of OFFICERS and GOVERNOURS* (x). Now let G. R. when he (x) *ibid.* has leisure, tell us how there can be a Subordination of Governours where the Sole Power of Government is incommunicably lodg'd in One Person. Again, being about to define what he means by a Dependence and Subordination of inferior Churches on, and to their Metropolis, he expresses it thus (y), *I mean by inferior Churches, the several Churches in the several lesser Cities, with the Region adjoining, administered and GOVERNED each of them by the Bishop of each such lesser City, and his OFFICERS UNDER HIM.* And particularly, (y) *ibid.* Ch. 7. Sect. 6. num. 7.

THAT he was very far from impropriating the *§ LXXXV.* POWER of Ordination to Bishops, is evident, from his *Vindication* against the *London Ministers* (z); for there he grants, that the Second Canon of the Fourth Council of Carthage, is a Testimony for the Fitness and Usefulness of that Custom, viz. of the Presbyters being Assistants to the Bishops in the Ordinations of Presbyters; which Custom, he says, is still retained and used in the Church of England, in all Ordinations of Presbyters. Now what can be a greater Argument of ones being satisfied with a Custom, than his allowing it to be both *Fit* and *Useful*? And (z) Chap 3 Sect. 7. n. 40.

AGREEABLY to all this, this Great Doctor still states *§ LXXXVI.* the grand Controversie, not upon the Solitude of Power, as G. R. would have it, but (as it ought indeed to be stated) upon PARITY and IMPARITY. Take it in his own words, in his Introduction to *Vind.* against the *London Ministers* (a): *The state of the Controversie, as it generally lies between us, is, whether the Apostles of Christ, when they planted Churches in each City, left them in the hands of MANY, to be GOVERNED by the COMMON COUNCIL of those MANY, erecting an EQUALITY or PARITY of several Rulers in every City, to whom all others were subjected, and they to None; or whether they placed (not the SOLE, but) the SUPERIOUR POWER and AUTHORITY in some ONE, and subjected all others to him?—This is the one Basis of all, &c.* So, I say, the Doctor states the Controversie: Neither does that which immediately follows, in the least,

obscure his meaning, viz. when he says, *Whether the Apostles planted PARITY or IMPARITY in the Church, MANY EQUAL Governours in one City, or but ONE in each?* For he himself hath put it out of all doubt, that by that Phrase, *Or but ONE in each*, he meant not ONE governing SOLELY, but One governing in CHIEF; for, *What* (says he) *is a Bishop in the Prelatic Sense, but a single Person governing in CHIEF, in a City or wider Circuit* (b)? And again, *The only Question is, whether the Power and Authority in each Church be placed in ONE OVER THE REST, or in more than One ruling together in COMMON* (c).

(b) *ibid.*

Sett. 5. of n. 5. Chap. 1.

(c) *ib. Sett. 6. n. 5.*

§ LXXXVII.

(d) *Chap. 3. Sett. 20. &c.*

IF my Reader desires more of Dr. HAMMOND, let him turn to his *Treatise of the Power of the Keys* (d); I shall only mention one more of his Books; his excellent Discourse about *Confirmation*, written in *Latin* against two very Learned Presbyterians, *Blondel* and *Dallam*; a Book, which if G. R. would read, he might perhaps come to a better understanding of that antient Rite than he seems to have done, when he wrote the 39th. Section of his *Cyprianic Bishop examined*. The Learned Hammond, I say, in that Book, has plainly told us, as much as makes it evident to a Demonstration, that he was no *Advocate* for the SOLE POWER of Bishops: He was not for lodging the Power of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction* intirely and *incommunicably* in their Persons. You have his words on the Margin (e).

(e) *Quid si liberè concedamus Episcopos*

Apostolorum successores, potestatisque omnis ordinariæ quàm ipsi à Christo, Christus à patre, acceperunt ex asse hæredes factos, hanc aliis sicut ipsis visum fuit, vel in integrum vel ex parte communicasse; adeoque augescere, & in infinitum fere crescente fidelium numero, multa tandem Presbyteris secundariis aut partiaris ab Episcopo ubique concedita esse, ad quæ ipsi in personis suis non suffecerunt, paucis tantum sibi ipsis illas reservatis, quibus originalis prærogativa dignitas, & exortis potestatis apex incolumis & integer conservaretur? Sic certè rem verè & non per somnium gestam esse, Basilianæ synodus nos certos faciunt; omnem quippe sub viis xpoynua fideique in cunis vagientis infantia, & baptizandi & conficiendi coenam & sponsalia celebrandi, & elemosynam recipiendi dispensandique, & quidlibet demum Ecclesiasticum procurandi potestatem penes Episcopos fuisse affirmant, quæ post modum suis Modulis finibusque presbyteris, imò Diaconis & Subdiaconis concedita sunt; nec tamen unquam à Spiritu Sancto summo divini juris conditore, hujusmodi latam legem, aut tale quicquam Hierarchicis nostris per somnia visum fuisse, qua presbyteris ex sententia Episcopi ea facere non liceret quæ consultò decreverant Episcopi presbyteris committenda esse: Multa certè sunt quæ Episcopi communi per totum orbem consensu presbyteris reliquenda, paucula quæ sibi reservanda decreverant. Fruantur igitur liberè istis quæ concessa sunt, modò quæ non concessa sunt non attingant presbyteri. Hæc vir doctissimus, § 9, 10, 11.

Mr. DODWELL is the last of the Four I promised to § LXXXVIII. consider; G. R. in his Preface to his Cyprianic Bishop examined, calls him one who is very HIGH for Episcopal Authority. And indeed, such an Author he is, as I had rather contradict a Hundred than him. But blessed be God, there is no need for it. I will not collect all that might make for my purpose in his admirable Writings: e.g. his notable Book *De Jure Laicorum Sacerdotali*, Cap. 2. His Discourse of *One Altar and One Priesthood* (f). His Seventh (f) Vide Dissertation on *S. Cyprian*, where, all he pleads for as peculiarly belonging to a Bishop, is a NEGATIVE VOICE, Cap. 12. § VI. which, as I have said, is one thing, and SOLE POWER another (g). I will not put G. R. to so much thinking as (g) Differet perhaps it would require of him to fathom the Depth of Cyp. VII. Reason compriz'd in these Discourses. All therefore of § XLVI. Mr. Dodwell's, which I shall recommend to G. R.'s Perusal XLVII. shall be only one little plain Book, which I know to be- XLVIII. long to the Library of the College of *Edinburgb*; and so, at G. R.'s service.

IT is his Letters to Mr. Baxter: Mr. Baxter had had his § LXXXIX. recourse to the sorry Subterfuge of the SOLE POWER, and this, it seems, pretty frequently too; which gave Mr. Dodwell opportunity, more than once, both to express his dislike of SOLE POWER; and to affirm, that it is not practised in *England*, nor claimed by the Bishops. Take some Testimonies as they lie. Lett. 1. § V (b). he says, (b) p. 109. that for his own part, he could heartily wish, that Bishops did more consult their Presbyteries, than they actually (it seems) do in *England* and *Ireland*. And, Lett. 2. § XI. (i) he says, (i) p. 117. No Bishop (in *England*) undertakes the particular Cure of a whole Diocese, without the ASSISTANCE of his particular respective Parochians, when therefore (says he to M. B.) you ask whether it follows, that our Church Monarch can oversee all himself, without any Sub overseers, or rule them without any Sub-rulers; sure you cannot mean that this is the practice of our Diocesans. Again § VIII. (k) He wishes M. B. would con- (k) p. 137. sider how untrue it is, that the Dispensation of Discipline, even 138. as it is practised (in *England*) is managed by the Bishop ALONE, who has inferiour Officers for preparing things for his cognizance. And he tells M. B. that in his Book (1 sup- pose,

pose, his Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government, &c.) He professed himself desirous, that the Bishops would more communicate the great Affairs of GOVERNMENT with their Clergy, which, he confesses, he thinks more agreeable to the Primitive Form. And again § XIII. (1) If a Prince without

(1) p. 150.

Personal Abilities may yet govern a Kingdom by his Substitutes, much more may a Bishop with the like Substitutes, and personal Abilities besides. And it is plainly the case in practice among us (says he) for Bishops to govern their Dioceses, not ALONE, but by the Assistance of their Officers, besides the distinct subordinate Parochians. He has more to the same purpose § XIV.

(m) p. 154.

(n) p. 156,
&c.

(m) And what can be plainer than what he has § XVI. (n) M. B. had asked, Whether a Church Monarch can oversee all his Subjects, himself, without any Sub-overseers; or rule them without any Sub-rulers? And M. D. replies thus; I wonder that you should seem to forget the Practice of our Ministers, of ruling our Parishes, as Sub-rulers under the Bishop. It may be, your meaning is, that our Parish Ministers were not allowed a Part in the Supreme Government of their Churches; as if that were sufficient to deny them the Name of Proper Church Rulers. But you might have remembered 1. That my Desire was, that the Bishops, as in S. Cyprian's time, so now, would more communicate their Affairs of any considerable importance with their Presbytery. And 2. That even according to the Rubricks of our Church, the Parish Minister or Curate is allowed the Power not only of dissuading, but also of hindering notorious Ill livers, and uncharitable Persons from the Communion; only with provision, that they signify such their Proceedings to the Ordinary, within 14 days at the farthest, which was no more than necessary for keeping them to the Notion of SUB-, not PRINCIPAL RULERS.—And 3. It is plain that there are many SUB-RULERS under Princes, who are not of their own Privy Council; so you cannot therefore conclude the Parish-Ministers not to be SUB-RULERS under the Bishop, even now; because all great Affairs are not originally transacted by their Counsel. Nay 4. Your self confess LEGISLATION it self to be communicated to the inferiour Clergy, in the Lower House, in Convocations, when they make Canons, which are Church Laws; And this which is ONE of the HIGHEST Acts of Government being communicated to them, can you yet complain of

of their Exclusion from Government? And § XXXI. (o) (o) p. 217.

He most clearly allows to Presbyters the POWER of Baptizing, and imposing the Hand in reconciling Penitents, nay, and in Ordination, in Dependence on the Bishop. And § LXVI.

(p) M.B. having alledged, that in the Primitive Times Presbyters were Assistants in Discipline, and had a True Church Government, which now (in England) they have not. (p) p. 326, &c.

M. D. answers, If you mean such Government as you count

TRUE, in respect of their Parishioners, this you know is not denied them: They have a Power of executing their Ordinary's Commands among them, and to discharge their own Office, tho' with Dependence on the Bishop, which is as much as is consistent with an Ecclesiastic Monarchic Government. — If such as is

true in respect of the Government in general, even this they have in the Lower Houses of Convocations: So that all that you can complain of among us, as dissonant from the Primitive Example, is, that they are not indeed assistant at their Bishops Councils in every particular Act of Discipline. This you may remember, I wished reformed. — But if you think no Assistance

sufficient but such as may make them independent on their Bishop, that I have proved as far from the Practice of those earlier Ages, as of the present. Indeed, all along, he appropriates only the Supreme Decretory Power to the Bishop, and allows the Executive Power to Presbyters; and he calls them Sub-Governours, Sub-Rulers, Inferiour Church-Rulers, and allows them Subordinate Cure's; nay, he allows them an Inferiour Decretory Power; an Executive Power which may withal include something Decretory in Affairs of inferiour Concernment; which, tho' decretory, in respect of their Inferiours, is yet only Executive

in relation to the Sense and Design of their Supreme, to which they are even in such Cases confined, § XVII. (q). By this time the Reader may competently judg, whether it be likely that Mr. Dodwell will not very heartily allow of my stating of the main Controversie.

(q) p. 159.

AND now that Mr. Dodwell is in our view, let me tell G. R. that I do not think it was advisedly said by him, that he might debate a certain Parallel with that extraordinary Person (r). Adversaries of an ordinary size, for any thing we have yet seen, may be good enough for either G. R. or to Cyprianic T. F. The Parallel which G. R. says he might debate with

§ XC.

(r) Preface
Bishop exam.

Mr. Dodwell,

Mr. Dodwell, is, *That as Kings are invested by their Subjects, so Bishops, at first, might have been ordain'd or made by Presbyters; without any Diminution of their Episcopal Sovereignty, after their Installment.* I am not, at present, to debate this Point with G. R. when he has a mind for debating it, let him debate it with his own Friends; let him debate it with Calderwood, in his *Altare Damasceum* (s), who pleads very zealously, that Inferiours may inaugurate their Superiour, and cites *Whitaker* for it. Let him debate it with the Author of *The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Episcopacy* (t). Let him debate it with his Brother Principal, T. F. who has pretty faithfully transcribed Calderwood, in his *Rectius Instruendum* (u). And let him only answer me one Question; Who was it that commonly consecrated the Jewish High-Priest? Was it not done by some inferior Priest or Priests? And, if so, G. R. I think, without the help of other Spectacles, may see, that the Supreme Power, even by Divine Institution, may be lodg'd in a Person, to be invested with it, by the Ministry of his Inferiours. And so I proceed.

(s) p. 160,
16, 162.

(t) p. 9.

(u) p. 165,
166.

§ XCI.

(v) § 40.
pag. 54.

THESE are all the *Prelatic Advocates* I am at present in a condition to cite. I know there are many more: But as I have not seen them, so neither do I think it very needful to cite many more. I have adduced of *Scottish* and *English*, Seventy good, a Number, methinks, sufficient to absolve me from Singularity in stating the Controversie as I stated it; and withal (unless 70 of *One side* cannot be called *Many*) sufficient to discover G. R.'s Inadvertency, in affirming that I would not find *Many*, if any *One*, of either side, who did not state it on the SOLE POWER. G. R. does indeed say (v), that he may say, without Vanity, he has seen the strongest Advocates for Prelacy. I know neither whom he has seen, nor with what Application he has considered them; only I must have been very unlucky, if, having seen so many, I have only seen the *Weakest* of them; only those who have been so very weak, that they did not understand the true state of the Controversie. But this, I think, needs not give me much trouble, if it can be made appear

§ XCII.

II. THAT the Constitution of neither Church ascribes the SOLE POWER of either Ordination or Jurisdiction to Bishops: Sure I am, neither the Constitution, nor the cur-

rent

rent Practice of the Church of Scotland ascribes it. G. R. himself, as much as he pretends to the contrary, seems to have been convinc'd of this; for he tells us, that *Prelatic Power is higher in one Church than in another, as in England now, and in Scotland of late (w)*. Now I would gladly (w) § 9. know, how *Prelatic Power* can be said to be *higher in Eng. P. 10. land* than it was in *Scotland*; if in *Scotland* the *Bishops* had the **SOLE POWER** of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*. But I must make surer work than any that has no other Foundation than G. R's Concessions or Insinuations. And therefore I say

I. THE Constitution of our Church does not, never did, § XCIII. ascribe the **SOLE POWER** of either *Ordination* or *Jurisdiction* to our *Bishops*. It is not so much as pretended by our *Presbyterian Brethren*, that the *Superintendents* set over this Church, *Anno 1560.* or the *Bishops* established, *An. 1572.* were invested with such **SOLE POWER**. On the contrary, they are earnest, on all occasions, to have the People believe, that *Superintendents* had little or no more Power than other *Ministers*; and that those *Bishops* promoted, *Anno 1575.* had no more Power than those *Superintendents* (x). (x) So I come therefore to that which I reckon the only true and Genuine Constitution of the Government of the Church of Scotland, the Constitution which was erected by the General Assembly at Glasgow, *Anno 1610.* Neither shall I insist on one Argument, tho' a very good one, namely, That the *Bishops* then promoted did never pretend to more Power than the *Superintendents* were put in possession of, *Anno 1560.* and the *Bishops*, *Anno 1572.* I shall content my self with the Constitution it self: And to avoid all needless debates, I shall not take the account of it from *Spotswood* (y), but (y) p. 512. from *Calderwood*, G. R's own Friend and Historian, who tells us in his *True History of the Church of Scotland, &c.* that his Account of it was extracted word for word out of the Registers of that Assembly (z). Now (z) p. 635.

AS to **ORDINATION**, he gives the Decree of that Synod thus; ITEM, That all Presentations be directed hereafter to the Bishop; and upon any Presentation given, or otherwise suit made, by any to be admitted to the Ministry, the Bishop is to require the Ministers of those Bounds where he is to serve, to

B b

certifie

Mr. Jameson, Nazianz Quere. And G. R. in his Good old way defended. And Calderwood, in his Hist. &c.

§ XCIV.

certifie by their Testificat unto him, of the Party Suiter, his Conversation past, and Ability and Qualification for the Function; and upon the Return of their Testificat, the Bishop is to take further Tryal, and finding him qualified, and being ASSISTED by some such of the Ministry of the Bounds, where he is to serve, as he will assume to himself, he is then to perfect the whole Action of Ordination. By which Canon it is so plain, that the Bishop has neither the SOLE POWER of Examination, nor of Ordination; that Calderwood himself had nothing to say, but that it was Ridiculous to allow the Bishop to try the Candidate after the Brethren of the Bounds (i. e. the Presbytery) had tryed him (a). And that in the Point of Ordination, much is derogated from the Power of the Presbytery (b); not that the Power is entirely taken out of their hands, and lodg'd SOLELY in the Bishop. And,

§ XCV.

(a) p. 637.

(b) p. 638.

(e) p. 632,
633.

(f) p. 631.

(g) p. 631.

(k) p. 638.

(i) p. 637.

AS for JURISDICTION, is it not provided by that Assembly, that *Diocesan Synods shall be kept twice a Year* (c)? Are not *National Synods* (which always, by the Constitution, consist of Presbyters, having *Definitive Voices*, as well as Bishops) allowed of and approved (d)? Doth not Calderwood tell us, that that Assembly interposed most earnestly, with the King, that *Presbyteries might not be discharged* (e)? Is it not evident, that Presbyters, by the Appointment of that Assembly, were to have (not indeed a *Sovereign*, but) a *Subordinate Exercise of Jurisdiction* in the great Point of *Excommunication* (f)? And have we not this express Canon about a very weighty Point of *Jurisdiction*, ITEM, In *Deposition of Ministers*, the Bishop, ASSOCIATING to himself the Ministry of the Bounds where the Delinquent served, he is then to take Tryal of his Fault, and upon just cause found, to Deprive (g)? This Canon is so plain against the Bishops Sole Power, that Calderwood's Observation on it is, that By the Article of Deposition it followeth, that no Bishop, by himself, may try or deprive the Delinquent Minister (h). Indeed, all he found to reprehend, as being granted by the Decrees of that Assembly to the Bishop, was, that he got a NEGATIVE POWER, as he calls it (i); that is, in the Language of the Antient Church, That *nothing* was to be done without him: Not that all things were to be done by him ALONE.

IF the *Canons* mentioned needed more *Light*, it were § XCVI.
easie to bring it to them from many Hands: But I shall
content my self with once more citing this same Author,
Calderwood; and the Testimony which I shall adduce shall
be from a Book which was undoubtedly his, viz. *Epistola*
Philadelphi Vindiciæ, &c. where he tells us, that *The Power*
of Ordination and Jurisdiction, by that *Assembly*, was made
obnoxious to the Bishop; not committed to him solely; for,
says he, *The Members of that Assembly did not deny that Syn-*
ods and Presbyteries had Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction,
tho' they subjected that Power to the Bishops; for, they believed
they gave the Bishops only a NEGATIVE POWER, &c. (k) (k) In hoc
You have his words in the Margent. conventu vel
potius concil-

liabulo, Episcopis potestas ordinationis & jurisdictionis obnoxia reddita est. Nulla ordi-
natio in posterum rata nisi actum ordinationis consummaverit Episcopus: nullus mi-
nister exauktorandus, nullus vel sceleratissimus excommunicandus non probante aut ve-
tante Episcopo: Omnium presbyteriorum Episcopi præsides essent, si adfuerint; iis ab-
sentibus, quos ipsi vicarios constituent. Synodorum etiam provincialium ipsi præsides.
— Non enim negarunt qui illuc convenerant Synodes & presbyteria conventus presby-
terorum, hæc omnia potuisse obire munia, quamvis obnoxiam eis reddiderunt potestatem
tum ordinationis tum jurisdictionis — Sed NEGATIVAM tantum quandam POTE-
STATEM iis sese tribuisse censuerunt, & conjunctam cum conventu Ministrorum.
Vind. Epist. Phil. p. 102.

THIS, I say, thus established, and thus confessed by § XCVII.
Calderwood to have been established *Anno 1610.* is the *True*
Constitution of the Government of the Church of *Scotland*:
This is the *Foot* on which all *Scottish Bishops*, ever since,
have stood: This is the *Constitution* which was ratified by
Act of Parliament, *Anno 1612.* which was overturned *An-*
no 1638. and which was revived *Anno 1662.* It was in pur-
suance of the true Nature and Ends of this *Constitution*, that
the *Canons* published by the King's Authority, *Anno 1635.*
the *Canons* cited and insisted on by *G. R.* (l) for proving (l) § 6. p. 6.
that the *Scottish Bishops* have the *Sole Power*, were contri-
ved and digested. And this *Constitution* is the true *Thread*
which leads us to the *Genuine Sense* of them. And indeed,

WHEN one reads them over, considering them always § XCVIII.
with regard to this *Constitution*; that they were founded on
it, and framed in pursuance of it; he cannot but admire
how *G. R.* should have cited those *Canons*, to prove the *Sole*

Power of Bishops : For what can be more reasonable, nay obvious, than that we ought still to conclude them agreeable to, and explicable by, the *Constitution* on which they were founded, so long as there is no, nor the least, appearance of *Contradiction* or *Inconsistency* between them ? So long as there is nothing but perfect *Harmony* and *Concord*, which I affirm there is, between those *Canons* and that *Constitution* ? And all this will appear clearer yet (if it be capable of greater Clearness) when

§ XCIX.

2. WE consider the *constant current practice* of the Government of our Church, ever since the Year 1610. What need of many Words in a matter so evident ? In short then, as to *Ordination*, I do challenge G. R. and his whole Fraternity to produce *one instance* of a *Presbyter* ordained by any *Scottish Bishop*, since the Year 1610. without the *Concurrence* of *Presbyters*. The *Practice* of our Government has been every whit as clear in the point of *Jurisdiction*. For, have not our *Kirk Sessions*, our *Presbyteries*, and our *Synods*, always been *formal* and *stated* *Judicatories*, even under *Episcopal Government* ? Did not even these *inferiour Judicatories*, *Kirk-Sessions*, and *Presbyteries*, perform many *Acts* of *Jurisdiction*, without so much as consulting the Bishop ? Was ever any *Canon* made by any Bishop to be binding within his *Diocese*, without the *Consent* of the *major part* of his *Presbyters* ? Did ever *Scottish Bishop* *excommunicate* any Person, or *censure* any *Presbyter*, either by *Suspension* or *Deposition*, without the *Concurrence* of *Presbyters* ? Did they ever *claim* more, either in *Acts* of *Legislation* or *Censure*, than a *Negative Voice* ? Had not the *Presbyters* always, both in *Acts* of *Legislation* and *Censure*, a *Reciprocal Negative* over their Bishop ; that is, could he any more *act without them*, than they could *without him* ? It had been easie to have represented these things more fully ; but even what I have said may suffice, to make it seem not a little wonderful, that any Man, in opposition to so much Light, should have had the courage to charge our *Scottish Bishops* with assuming to themselves the *SOLE Power* of either *Ordination* or *Jurisdiction*.

THE Case is every whit as clear concerning the Churches of England and Ireland: For, as to Ordination, besides what we may learn from divers of the most Learned of the Church of England, such as Hooker, Hall, Hammond, &c.

(m) What can be plainer than the very Rubrick in her Form of Ordering of Priests, which requires, That the Bishop, with the Priests present, shall lay their Hands severally on the Head of every one that receiveth Orders, viz. the Orders of a Priest or Presbyter; for in the Ordering of a Deacon, the Bishop alone imposes. And by the 31st. Canon, made Anno 1603. it is expressly required, that Ordinations be performed by the Bishop, with the Assistance of Four Presbyters, at fewest: And by Canon 35th. that the Bishop shall diligently try him who is to be ordained, in the presence of those Ministers who are to assist him in the Imposition of Hands. And the 29th. and 32d. Canons of the Church of Ireland, agreed upon in the Synod of Dublin, Anno 1634. are to the same purpose. And agreeably, both Churches pray every day in the Ember-Weeks, that Almighty God may so guide and govern the Minds of his Servants, the Bishops and Pastors of his Flock, that they may lay hands suddenly on no Man, but faithfully and wisely make choice of fit Persons to serve in the Sacred Ministry of his Church. And

(m) See their Testimonies above, § LII. LXV. LXXXV.

AS for Jurisdiction; how easie were it to shew, how many ways Presbyters have an Interest in it? But I shall only name Two at present: By the Canons of both Churches (n), the Bishop, to the Deposition of a Minister, must have the Assistance of Three Presbyters, at least. And what nobler Act of Jurisdiction can there be, than that of Legislation?

§ CI.

Now, concerning this, I cannot give it better, than in the words of Dr. Stillingfleet, in his Unreasonableness of Separation (o), a Book of G. R.'s good Acquaintance; There are no Rules of Discipline; no Articles of Doctrine; no Form of Divine Service are to be received or allowed in this Nation (and the same may be said of Ireland); but, by the Constitution of this Church, the Presbyters have their Votes in passing them, either in Person, or by Proxy: For, all things of that nature are to pass both by Houses of Convocation; and the Lower House consists wholly of Presbyters, who represent the whole Presbytery of the Nation, either appearing by their own Rights,

(n) See Canon Engl. 122. Irish 71.

(o) Part 3. § 12. p. 265, 266.

as.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

as many do; or, as being chosen by the rest; from whom, by Indentures they either do or ought to receive Power to transact things in their Names: And the Custom of this Church hath sometimes been, for the Clergy of the Dioceses to give limited Proxies, in particular Cases, to their Procurators. Now I appeal to any Man of understanding (says he) whether the Clergy of this Church have their whole Power (swallowed up by the Bishops, when yet the Bishops have no Power to oblige them to any Rules or Canons, but by their own consent; and they do freely vote in all things of common Concernment to the Church; and therefore the Presbyters are not, by the Constitution, deprived of their share in One of the greatest Rights of Government, viz. in making Rules for the whole Body. And if G. R. or any of his Brethren, are unwilling to take the word of that most Learned Person (tho' it is plain, it must be without reason, if they are unwilling), then, they may have their recourse to their own Friend, Mr. Blondel, who (having cited Theophilus Iscanus, whom he calls a most Learned Man, affirming, that never any English Bishop arrogated to himself alone the Power of Ordination) goes on to tell, that Iscanus had reason to affirm so; For, says he, neither the Confession of the English Church, nor her Apology, nor her Catechism, nor her Liturgy, nor her Form of Ordinations, requires from any Man, any manner of way, that he should believe that Bishops have the SOLE POWER of Ordinations, or any other Ecclesiastical Functions (p). And then he proceeds to shew, that the English Constitution falls in most exactly with the Opinion of S. Jerom, &c. And so I proceed

(p) Nec immerito (Isca-
nus, nempe,
Anglicano-
rum præsulum
neminem sibi
SOLI arrogare

Ordinationem, &c.) cum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, nec Confessio, nec Apologia, nec Catechesis, nec Liturgia, nec Ordinandi Forma, ullo modo à quoquam exigat ut—
penes Episcopos SOLOS Ordinationum, aliarumque Ecclesiasticarum functionum potestatem esse debere credat. Imò ad Hieronymi mentem appositissimè, &c. Apol. pro Sent. Hieron. p. 161. vide plura p. 288.

§ CII.

III. TO shew that the true State of the Controversie is, whether the Church should be governed by Pastors acting in PARITY, having equal Power, without the Superiority of any One Pastor over Other Pastors. It follows so very plainly and necessarily from the preceding Deduction, that this, and this alone, must be the true State of the Question, that

it

it may seem superfluous to be at any further pains to prove it. But having undertaken so to fix this Matter, as that hereafter our Presbyterian Brethren and we may understand one another, I shall proceed a little further. And

1. IF it were needful, it were not very difficult to prove very fully, that this is the true state of the Question, from the Writings on both sides. I have already sufficiently accounted for the *Prelatic* side. I might do it as plentifully for the *Presbyterian*. I might adduce the very words of *Smectymnus*, from their 5th. Section, and from their *Vindication* (q), where they do thus address to their Adversary: (q) p. 175. *Shortly, resolve us but this one thing, what is it that makes a Man out of the Ordinary Rank of Presbyters, and advanceth him to an IMPARITY, and Power of Jurisdiction.* I might likewise adduce the very words of the *Provincial Assembly of London*; in their *Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani* (r): (r) Chap. 4. *Of some Ministers in the City of London*, in their *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici* (s): *Of the Divines at Newport*, (s) p. 140, in their *First Paper to his Majesty*: *Of Mr. Peregrin*, in his *Letters Patents for Presbytery* (t): *Of Salmasius*, in his (t) p. 4. *Walo Messalinus* (u); and in his *Apparatus ad Libros de* (u) p. 10. *primatu Papæ* (v): And I do not know how many more: (v) p. 199, But I shall satisfy my self (and, I hope, my Reader too) 200. with an account of some 5 or 6 of our *Scottish Presbyterians*; particularly,

§ CIII.

Mr. B A R L I E, in his *Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Episcopacy*, writes thus (w), *Suppose Episcopacy were* (w) p. 8. *shaven, and stript naked of all External and Heterogeneous Pomp and Power, and of the Internal Power of SOLE Ordination and Jurisdiction. Suppose nothing were left to the Bishops but a perpetual Presidency in Church Assemblies and Synods: Suppose him to be chosen by the Clergy, and to be subject to their Censures, as other Ministers: And suppose all the Cautions and Limitations that can be devised be put upon him, to keep him within his Bounds from Exorbitancy, yet still he is such a Plant as God never planted; rooted not in Scripture, but in the Earth, and bringing forth such Fruits as can neither be acceptable to God, nor profitable to Man.*

§ CIV.

§ CV.

THE Author of the Work, entituled, *Certain Reasons tending to prove the Unlawfulness and Inexpediency of all Diocesan Episcopacy, even the most moderate*, printed Anno 1641. lays this down for his 4th. Position (x); *The least and most Moderate Episcopacy (as distinct from, and superiour to the Office of Presbyters) is both in it self unlawful, and also unto us dangerous, and therefore not to be admitted.* Then, for Explanation and Illustration of this Thesis, he subjoyns thus, *Granting that the Grand Episcopacy now in being (in England) should be pulled down so low, as that the Bishop should have nothing left him, but only (as some have projected) a good Benefice, with Cure of Souls, whereto they should be ty'd, and which they should diligently feed, as other Ordinary Pastors.* 2. *Very small Dioceses.* 3. *The Name Bishop peculiar to themselves.* 4. *To Ordain Ministers in their Dioceses, but not without Concurrence of other Ministers.* 5. *And by their Advice and Assistance, to order lesser matters in the several Congregational Assemblies.* 6. *And in Assemblies or publick Meetings of Presbyteries, Classes, &c. to be constant Moderators during Life, upon condition of their good Government.* 7. *To have a Negative, or a Double, or, at least, a Casting Voice, when things come to be voted.* 8. *To have these Prebeminences settled upon them, as by a standing Law, and as due by Right unto their Office; I say, though they were stripp'd of all the rest, yea, and of many of these too, if you will, yet cannot such an Office be lawful in the Church.*

§ CVI.

THE Author of the *Case of Accommodation, &c.* printed Anno 1671. having set down these words of Bishop Leighton's Second Letter, *That the Bishop shall not be found desirous to usurp any undue Power, but rather ready to abate of that Power which is reasonable, &c.* replies thus (y), *It is answered, The Author is mistaken in the very Entry, in as much as we do not only question the Power, but are directly against the Prebeminence of a fixed Præses; the thing is in it self unwarrantable, &c.* Again, *Notwithstanding of any thing conceded in the Articles, and over and above all that hath been said against an Episcopus præses, even in the most moderate acceptation, the Bishop, as offered to be reduced, is repugnant both to Scripture, purer Antiquity, and our solemn Oaths and Engagements, inconsistent with the Principles of Presbytery, &c.* (z).

(z) p. 92.

Once

Once more, I say (says he) true Presbyterian Government doth not admit, amongst the Lord's Ministers, any stated IMPARITY, either in Power, Prerogative or Presidency; one, or all of which, is the very Form of the controverted Episcopacy; therefore they are (what all Men hitherto constantly deem'd them to be) utterly inconsistent (a).

(a) p. 125.

Mr. JAMESON, in his Preface to his *Naxianzeni Quere-la*, says (b), That his Work is to prove, that during the Apostolic Age, and the prime Primitive Church, there was a Bishop for each Congregation, an Identity of Bishop and preaching Presbyter; and finally, a complete PARITY of ordinary Pastors. And in his Work (c), That the peculiar Hypothesis of Presbyterians, wherein they oppose Prelacy, is, that no Pastor ought to usurp a Dominion or Superiority over his Brethren. And again (d), Moreover (says he) it is most certain, that in Matt. 20, 25, 26, 27, 28. The Princes of the Gentiles, &c. and Mark 10. 42, 43, 44, 45. and Luke 22. 25, 26, 27. All Pastors of flocks are prohibited to exercise Dominion, Secular and State-Dignity; and a PARITY of the Apostles among themselves, and in them, a PARITY of all ordinary Pastors or Ministers of the Gospel, among themselves, is enjoined.

§ CVII.

(b) p. 8, 9.

(c) p. 16, 17.

fuic.

(d) p. 235.

MUCH might be adduced from Mr. Forrester's Books to this purpose; but for brevity, one clear Testimony shall suffice at present. It is in his *Examination of Dr. Monro's Pleadings*; The words these (e), That by Original Authority of Christ and his Apostles, all Churches ought to be governed by a Parity of Presbyters or Pastors; and that no Ecclesiastical Officer above a Presbyter, can pretend to a share in Ecclesiastical Government.

§ CVIII.

(e) p. 6.

ONE Author more to make out the half Dozen. It is even G. R. himself, who more than once has made PARITY and IMPARITY, and not SOLE POWER, the State of the Controversie. Thus in his *Rational Defence of Non Conformity* (f), We are grieved with Prelatical Government (says he), and taking away that Parity of Power that Christ hath given to the ordinary Ministers of his Church. Again, (g) It is neither the Presidency, nor the Precedency, that we debate about, but the IMPARITY of Church-Power and Authority. Further yet, He (Dr. Stillingfleet) undertaketh to prove, that the English Episcopacy doth not take away the whole

§ CIX.

(f) Part. 3.

Sect. I. § 2.

(g) ibid.

Sect. 3. § 2.

Power of Presbyters. — Now consider what G. R. subjoyns, *We do not ailedg (says he) that it taketh away the whole Power of Presbyters; for that were to reduce them into the same Order with the rest of the People: But we say, it usurpeth an undae Power over them, that neither Christ, nor the Primitive Church ever allowed, in taking out of their hands that Power of governing the Church which they have EQUAL with the Bishop (h).* And in his *Vindication of his Church of Scot-*

(b) *ibid.*

Sect. 4. § 11.

(i) *Quest. I.*

(k) *Answ. to Quest. I.*

land against the Author of the Ten Questions, he is every whit as plain: For his Adversary having wholly excluded the Solitude of Power from the State of the Question, attributing only to Bishops a fixed, regulated, and limited Superiority (i). G. R. tells him, He stateth his Question with no great shew of Understanding in these Controversies. — And, He overlooketh that which is the CHIEF (yea, the ONLY) Question on which the Controversie with the Prelatists doth turn, viz. Whether the Government of the Church should be in the hands of a single Person, or of a Community? Whether the Rulers of the Church ought to manage that Work in PARITY, or ONE should manage it as SUPREME, and the rest in SUBORDINATION to him (k)? So G. R. himself (I say) has sometimes stated the Controversie. And yet after all,

§ CX.

WHAT tho he had no where been so *honest*, as to have thus given us the true *State* of the *Question*? What though in all his Books he had still *mis-stated* it, as he has done his *Cyprianic Bishop Examined*, where it was his *Interest* to *mis-state* it? What tho' he had written twice so many Books, and suffered twice so many Years on the side of a Controversie he never understood the *State* of? What of all this, I say? Could either his always *mis-stating*, or his always *mis-understanding* it, have been sufficient to have either *altered* or *obscured* the true *State* of it? Could it, in any reason, have done any more than exposed One of Three, his *Ignorance*, or his *Inadvertency*, or his *Disingenuity*? Certainly it could not: For though he had never written a Syllable about it, yet

2. That

2. That PARITY and IMPARITY, and not SOLE POWER, must be the *true State* of it, might be farther made to appear, from the consideration of the *true Force* and *Tendency* of all the *common Arguments* insisted on by either *Party* for determining this Controversie. What can be more notorious, than that the Arguments insisted on by the *Presbyterians*, are *mainly* and *principally* design'd by them, to prove, that the *Church* ought to be governed by *Pastors acting in Parity*? G. R. himself, I am confident, will not say that they are designed *meerly* and *precisely* to overturn the SOLE POWER of *Bishops*. But what needs more? Will G. R. and his Brethren be satisfied to submit to *Prelatical Government*, if Bishops shall renounce all *Preensions* to a SOLE, and *claim* no more but a CHIEF POWER in *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*? Will they chearfully and readily admit of an IMPARITY of *Power* between Bishops and Presbyters? If they will, I dare almost promise, in the *Name* of all *Scottish Prelatists*, that they shall meet them with equal *Readiness* and *Chearfulness*. But if they will not, then, is it not plain, that they must look upon their Arguments as concluding something *more* than the *bare Eversion* of the Bishops SOLE POWER? as concluding that PARITY of *Power* among *Pastors* is of *Divine Institution*?

§ CXI.

AS little can the Arguments, commonly insisted on by the *Prelatists*, be rationally design'd for concluding, that the Bishop has the SOLE POWER; for concluding more than that an IMPARITY, or a MAJORITY, or a SUPERORITY of *Power* is *due* to them. This likewise might easily be made to appear by an *Induction* and *Examination* of those Arguments. Thus, to try it in some Instances. Is it imaginable, that any thinking Man did ever insist on the Argument taken from the *Jewish Hierarchy*, with a design thereby to conclude, that Christian Bishops ought to have the SOLE POWER of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*? Who ever thought that the SOLE POWER of *Government* was lodged in the *High-Priest's Person*? You may try it likewise in the Argument taken from the *Twelve Apostles*, and the *Seventy Two Disciples*: From the *Gradations* mentioned 1 Cor. 12. 28. and Eph. 4. 11. From the Instances of

§ CXII.

Timothy and Titus: From the *Apocalyptic Angels, &c.* very few Authors, I think, have intended to conclude more than an *Imparity* by them. This is certain, no more could be intended, with any colour of Reason, by all those who proceed (with great Reason) on the *Hypothesis*, That the *Apostles* did at first ordain *Presbyters* to be *Subordinate Governors* in the Churches which they planted, reserving to themselves the *Supreme Power*, which, afterwards, before their Departure, they committed to those *Bishops* whom they consecrated to be their *Successors* in that *Supreme Power* over those Churches.

§ CXIII. THE like may be said of the Argument taken from the Constitution of the *Primitive Churches*: For, as the *Prelatists* do reckon it, in a very great measure, their *Glory* as well as their *Security*, that the Constitution of both Churches, the *Scottish* and the *English*, is fairly transcribed, for Substance, at least, from the excellent and irreprobable Pattern of the *Primitive Churches*, the Churches of the *first* and *purest* Ages; so, as we heard, they do generally acknowledg that in those Ages, *Presbyters* were not excluded from all Interest in the Government.

§ CIV. NEITHER is it to be imagined that ever the *Prelatists* did intend to conclude either the *Necessity* or the *Convenience* of investing *Bishops* with the *SOLE POWER* of Government, by the Arguments commonly insisted on to shew the *intrinsic Usefulness* of *Episcopacy*; such as those taken from the *Excellency* of Order and the *Aptitude* that is to be found in *Episcopacy* for the *distinct Method*, and by consequence, the *regular Dispatch* of Business: For the *Vigour* and *Success* of Discipline: For the *avoiding* of Confusions: For the *securing* of Peace: For the *preservation* of Unity: For the *prevention* of Schisms, &c. For who sees not that all those Ends may be every way as well, if not much better, obtained by allowing to the *Bishop* a *Chief Power*, a *Superiority* of Power, a *Negative Voice*, the *Prerogative* that nothing is to be done without him, than by lodging the *SOLE POWER* in him? And

§ CXV. ALL this might be farther illustrated by a distinct Consideration of those *Similitudes* and *Resemblances* which are commonly insisted on, to help People to a clear and intelligible

ligible and genuine *Idea* of *Episcopal Government*, such as that of the *Consular Power* among the *Romans*, or the *Mayor* of a *City*, or the *Head* of a *College*, or a *temperate Monarchy*, or the *Order* of an *Army*, &c. For who did ever dream, that the *General* of an *Army* had the *SOLE POWER* over it, so as to *exclude* all *inferiour Officers* from a *subordinate Command*? Or that the *Roman Consuls* enhaunced *all Power*, and left *none* to the *Senate*? Or the *Mayor* of a *City*, suppose the *Provost* of *Edenburgh*, had the *SOLE POWER* of *Government* in the *City*, to the *Exclusion* of the *other Magistrates*, or of the *Common-Council*? Nay, who ever imagined, that in a *Temperate Monarchy*, the *King* has the *Sole Power* lodged in his *Person*, when it is certain, he cannot make so much as *One single Law* without the *Consent* of his *Parliament*? The like may be said concerning the other *Resemblances* that are commonly insisted on in this matter. And now at length to come to a *Conclusion* of this very long, and perhaps, tedious *Deduction* concerning the *State* of the *Main Controversie* between us and our *Brethren*.

FROM what hath been said, the Reader may perceive whether *G. R.* had reason to say that *I would not find many, if any one, of either side, who handleth this Controversie without respect to SOLE POWER.* He may perceive whether *G. R.* (as I have hinted before) has ever had a true *Notion* of the *Controversie*, as much as he has written, and pretends to have suffered about it. And he may perceive whether *G. R.* has solidly answered most of the *Arguments* contained in *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, when he has, to most of them, return'd no better Answer, than, that they did not infer the *Bishop's Sole Power* of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*. And not only so, but *He*, and all the other *Advocates* of his *Party*, may do well, hereafter, to consider whether they can betake themselves to this *Subterfuge* of *SOLE POWER*, with the least *Pretensions* of *Ingenuity* and *Fair Dealing*; or rather, without the *manifest Scandal* of an *incurable Wilfulness*, and a *notorious Effrontery*. I ask liberty to use these hard words, not that I have any *Inclinations* to be fierce; but because some Men stand in need of loud Cries to make them advertent.

§ CXVI.

C H A P. V.

G. R.'s Second Main Subterfuge, viz. *That a Bishop, in S. Cyprian's time, had only MORE DIGNITY, but not MORE POWER than Presbyters, proposed; and attacked, first, by producing a Specimen of the Terms and Phrases which do frequently occur in the Monuments of the Cyprianic Age, and necessarily import a Majority of Power, as well as Dignity, lodg'd in the Persons of Bishops, as contra-distinct from Presbyters.*

§ I.

ANOTHER of G. R.'s main Subterfuges, is, that a Bishop in S. Cyprian's time had MORE DIGNITY than Presbyters, but not MORE POWER. This, he has told us in the conclusion of his Preface, is, that which he undertakes to maintain throughout his Book. *I affirm, says he, that though it is manifest that a Bishop was above the Presbyter in Dignity and Order, yet he did not rule the Church by himself, but the Presbyters had EQUAL POWER with him in managing Church Government.* By this Distinction he has attempted to avoid the Force of many of my Arguments. Thus, he says, *He cannot find, in Chamier, one word asserting, that in the first Three Centuries, Bishops had the Rule of the Church above Presbyters, further than that they were above them in DIGNITY; and by a PRIORITY of ORDER, not of JURISDICTION (a).* And, *Salmasius, in Walo Messalinus doth strongly maintain the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter in the first Three Ages; and is far from acknowledging any further difference between them till Jerom's time, than of GREATER DIGNITY (b).* With what Modesty he has so affirmed concerning both Authors, (c) Chap. III. hath been already considered (c).

(a) § 11.
p. 13.

(b) § 13.
p. 15.

(c) Chap. III.
§

H E

HE says, *The Bishops* **SUBLIME FASTIGIUM SACER-**
DOTII signifies no more than that his **POWER** was elevated
to a **HIGHER DIGNITY**, though not **GREATER**
AUTHORITY than the Presbyters (d). He does in- (d) § 21.
deed confess, that there was more Solemnity in installing a P. 26.
Bishop in S. Cyprian's time, than Presbyterians now use in
making a Moderator; but then, it is only because it was con-
sequential to the Bishops being constantly, and for Life, in that
Office; and to that Prelation of **DIGNITY** above other Pres-
byters, that he then had (e). He tells us, that it is clearly (e) § 23.
insinuated in S. Cyprian's Forty First Epistle, that the Diffe. P. 28.
rence of the Bishop and Presbyters of his time, was, that HE
had more **HONOUR** than THEY, but not more **AU-**
THORITY (f). He affirms, that in S. Cyprian's Com- (f) § 46.
plaint, that his Presbyters had not reserv'd to him the Ho- p. 65.
nour of his Priesthood and Chair, Ep. 17. There is nothing
inconsistent with the **POWER** or the **STILE** of the Mode-
rator of a Presbytery, or the Pastor of a Congregation, save
that the Moderator, then, being constant, his part in the Man-
agement of publick Affairs was more **OBVIOUS**, and
therefore, more **TAKEN NOTICE OF** (g). And, (g) § 52.
whereas I had said, that in S. Cyprian's time, the Members P. 77.
of the Episcopal College were always considered as Church
Governours, notoriously distinguished from Presbyters; he
answers, that this Distinction lay in the **DIGNITY** that
the Declensions of that Age from Apostlic Simplicity gave
them; not in any **POWER** that they had which Presbyters
had not (h).

IT were easie to give many more Instances to this pur-
pose, but I shall adduce only other Two, which seem to
me to be singularly surprising. One is about Tertullian's
Testimony, which you have on the Margent (i); For,
take G. R's word for it, and it doth neither signifie, nor can
import, that Presbyters baptized in Subordination to the Bishop,
or with his Permission: All that can be built on it, is, a **PRIOR**
DIGNITY to the Bishop, in this, and other parts of the Mi-
nisterial Work (k). The other is, that, having cited
S. Austin's Testimony, which you have likewise on the

(h) § 60.
p. 88.
§ III.
(i) Dandi
quidem (Bap-
tismum) jus
habet summus
sacerdos qui
est Episcopus;
Dehinc Pres-
byteri & Dia-
coni, non ta-
men sine Epif-

copi Auctoritate, &c. De Bap. c. 17. (k) § 49. p. 72.

(1) Quamquam secundum honorem vocabula quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit episcopatus presbyterio major est tamen in multis rebus Augustinus Hieronymo minor est. Ep. 19. (m) § 38. p. 51. (n) Sect. 6. § 13.

(o) *ibid.* § 12.

§ IV.

Margent (l). He makes Observations on it (m): And the First is, *That Austin placeth the Prelation of the Bishop above a Presbyter, in the Title of DIGNITY, but speaketh not a word of a SUPERIOR POWER.* Now that which makes this so surprizing, is, that G. R. when he wrote his *Good Old Way defended*, seems quite to have forgot that ever he had made such an *Observation* in his *Cyprianic Bishop examined*: For there, he laughs at his Adversary for being at pains to maintain, that *Austin* was no Presbyterian. And pray, says he, *who ever said he was one? That way was past its Meridian in the World a little before his time* (n). So that though *Austin* was no Presbyterian; though Episcopacy was *past its Meridian a little before his time*; yet he allowed no *Superiour Power* to Bishops. Here, I think, is work for G. R.'s reconciling Faculty. But what wonder, if after a Year or two, G. R. did forget that ever he had made the aforesaid *Observation*, when it is considered, that probably, within an hour before he acknowledged that Episcopacy *was past its Meridian in S. Austin's time*, he had told his Adversary that *Jerom's making a Distinction between Episcopos and Clericos, can be drawn to no more but this, that in his time* (which was much the time with *Austin's*) *there was an observable Prelation in matter of DIGNITY; but it no way proveth a SUPERIORITY of JURISDICTION, though some were then AIMING at it* (o). Very right! Bishops were but AIMING at a SUPERIORITY of JURISDICTION, even after Episcopacy *had pass'd the Meridian*. Thus you see how much this Distinction between POWER and DIGNITY, is one of G. R.'s Subterfuges; a Subterfuge, indeed, which might be exposed in very few words. For,

1. THO' it be notoriously ridiculous in most, and unserviceable in all the Instances adduced; yet, granting that it had been used seasonably, and applied pertinently; granting that the Edge of some of my Arguments had been truly blunted by it; yet it would have signified nothing against the Main of my Book. G. R. himself, seems to have been sensible of this. What else than the Sense of this can be imagined to have mov'd him so frequently to

to flee to the former Subterfuge of the SOLE POWER? So frequently, I say, for to it he has recurr'd, at least Five or Six times, for Once that he has had the Confidence to seek for shelter in this Distinction. Indeed

2. MOST, if not all, of the Arguments insisted on in the *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, are Demonstrations of the Unserviceableness of this Distinction. Demonstrations, I say, and firm and standing Demonstrations, till G. R. or some other for him, shall offer more material Answers to them, than any he has offered in his *Cyprianic Bishop examined*, as, I am confident, every intelligent and impartial Reader will confess, who has compared our Books. Nay,

§ V.

3. HE himself, by the *Concessions* of a Majority of Power in Bishops, in the *Cyprianic Age*, has made, on divers occasions, has notoriously thrown up all the Security that possibly might have been expected from this *Subterfuge*. Has he not expressly granted, that, in that Age, *Declensions were made from absolute Parity*? And that a Bishop, then, by reason of his Fixation in his Office, and by Custom, had crept into SOME MORE POWER than was DUE? I have already (p) given a large account of such *Concessions*, *Concessions* utterly irreconcilable with this *Subterfuge*. And then

§ VI.

4. THO' we had had no such *Concessions* from him, yet we have it fairly conceded by *Blondel*, *Salmasius*, *Daleus*, &c. in a word, by all Learned Presbyterians, that, in S. Cyprian's time, the *Impropriation of Names* had obtained; and that this *Impropriation* was not made before, but rather after Bishops were possessed of a Majority of Power (q). In short, G. R. must either renounce the common Principles of Presbyterians, or he must acknowledg, that from the very beginning, the *Primi Presbyteri*, the Moderators of Presbyteries were *higher in Dignity* than the rest of the Presbyters, even whilst the *Names* were common, and promiscuously used; even before there was any *Impropriation* of them. Now, supposing this, for once, to be true, I would gladly know, why the *Impropriation* was made; if, when it was made, no more than *higher Dignity*, no more than *Priority of Order*, in the Presbyterian Sense, was imported

(p) Supra, cap. 11. § V, VI, &c.

§ VII.

(q) CHAP. III. § 20, &c. 32, &c. 60.

by the Name, *Bishop*? Were not Moderators in possession of that *Priority of Order*, of that *Majority of Dignity*, before such Impropriation was made? If Bishops then, even after such Impropriation, were no more than Moderators; if they had *no more Power* than other Presbyters, why make such Impropriation? Why make it for no other reason, than to signify such *Priority of Order*, such *Majority of Dignity*? But what needs more? How many Learned Presbyterians have I already adduced, who have readily acknowledged, that in *S. Cyprian's* time, there was a *Proper Prelacy* even of *Power* as well as *Dignity*, lodg'd in the Persons of Bishops (r)? These Considerations might, in all reason, be sufficient to justify my forbearing to take any further notice of this Subterfuge. But

(r) CHAP. III.
per tot.

§ VIII.

BECAUSE G. R. may possibly pretend to be Master of his own Concessions, and retract them when he has a mind for it; because, when he finds himself in Streights, he may possibly think it fit to leave his greatest Masters, and even the common Principles of Presbytery, and shift for himself; because this Subterfuge is not peculiar to him, but a common Retreat to many of his Party; because the utter Subversion of it may be of considerable Usefulness for shortning our Controversies for the future; and because the vast Magazine of Evidences for Episcopal *Superiority* even of *Power*, contain'd in the *Cyprianic* Monuments, was very far from being exhausted by the Collection I made in my former Book; for these Reasons (especially the two last) I shall be at some further pains about it, and offer to the Reader's Consideration, by way of Supplement to the Evidences contain'd in my former Treatise, what follows in this, and the Two succeeding Chapters: All which laid together, I am hopeful, may make our Presbyterian Brethren asham'd to betake themselves hereafter to such a sorry Subterfuge. I cannot promise for any Accuracy of Method; that is not easily to be observ'd in Supplements. However, that I may not seem to have proceeded altogether without Method, I shall reduce what I am to propose, to these Three Heads: FIRST, I shall give a *Specimen of Terms and Phrases* frequently occurring in the Monuments of the *Cyprianic Age*, which do necessarily

rily import a *Majority of Power*, as well as *Dignity*, lodg'd in the Persons of the Bishops of that Age, as they were contra-distinguished from Presbyters. **SECONDLY**, I shall give such a *Specimen* of substantial *Prerogatives*, whereof the Bishops of that Age were in possession, as, when duly pondered, may make it evident, that those *Terms* and *Phrases* were proper, and importing such *Majority of Power*, imported no more than was consequential to these *Prerogatives*. **THIRDLY**, I shall give such a Representation of the Bishops *Sovereign Interest* in some of the most material and weighty *Acts of Government*, as shall further confirm both the *Propriety* of those *Terms*, and the *Reality* of those *Prerogatives*.

FIRST, I shall give a *Specimen* of *Terms* and *Phrases* frequently occurring in the Monuments of the Cyprianic Age, which do necessarily import a *Majority of Power* as well as of *Dignity*, lodg'd in the Persons of the Bishops of that Age, as they were contra-distinguished from Presbyters. Indeed such *Terms* and *Phrases* are not only so numerous, are not only so frequently used, but likewise so emphatic, so remarkably significant, that one who has considered those Monuments, with any tolerable Degrees of Skill and Attention, can hardly escape the being surprized, when he finds it made a Question, Whether Bishops, in that Age, had more Power than Presbyters. For my part, I cannot forbear to say, that whoso makes a Question of it, seems either never to have considered those Monuments, or to have a goodly Faculty at making Questions. But to our purpose.

§ IX.

I. S. CYPRIAN very frequently uses the word **HONOR** to signify the **POWER**, and not the bare *Dignity* of Bishops. Thus, *Ep. 3.* he tells *Rogatianus*, that his insolent Deacon ought to do Penance for his Insolency, and acknowledge the **HONOUR** that is, evidently, the Authority, the Superiour Power of his Bishop (s); as appears from what immediately follows; But if he shall continue to *importune and provoke thee* (says he) thou mayst use the **POWER**

§ X.

(s) - & ideo oportet Diaconum agere audacie suae penitentiam, & HONOREM

D d 2

SACERDOTIS agnoscere, & **EPISCOPO** PRÆPOSITO suo, plena humanitate satisfacere: Quod si ultra te contumeliis suis exacerbaverit & provocaverit, funderis circa eum **POTESTATE HONORIS** tui ut eum vel **DEPONAS** vel **ABSTINEAS**, *Ep. 3. p. 6.*

of thine HONOUR against him, either by deposing or excommunicating him. Here, I think Honour imports Authority, Superiour Jurisdiction with a witness. And Ep. 15. he highly resents, that while as the Martyrs and Confessors behaved themselves dutifully towards himself, their Bishop, yet some of his Presbyters, neither regarding the Fear of God, nor the HONOUR of their Bishop (that is plainly his Sovereignty) had presumed to instigate the Martyrs against him, and to reconcile the Lapsed without his allowance (t).

(t) — Nunc cum maximo animi dolore cognosco non tantum illic vobis (Martyribus & Confessoribus) non suggeri divina praecepta, sed adhuc potius impediri, ut ea quae à vobis ipsis, & circa Deum cautè, & circa SACERDOTEM DEI, HONORIFICAE fiunt, à quibusdam presbyteris resolvantur, qui nec timorem Dei, nec EPISCOPI HONOREM cogitant, &c.

Ep. 15. p. 33.

(u) Hi (Presbyteri) sublato HONORE quem nobis beati Martyres cum Confessoribus servant, contempta Domini lege & observatione, quam iidem Martyres & Confessores tenendam mandant, ante extinctum persecutionis metum, ante REDITUM NOSTRUM, — communicent cum lapsis, &c. Ep. 16. p. 38.

(v) Audio tamen quosdam de Presbyteris nec Evangelii memores, nec quid ad nos Martyres scripserint cogitantes, nec EPISCOPO HONOREM SACERDOTII sui & CATHEDRAE reservantes, jam cum lapsis communicare coepisse, &c. Ep. 17. p. 39.

(w) Dominus noster — EPISCOPI HONOREM, & Ecclesiae suae rationem disponens, in Evangelio loquitur & dicit Petro, &c. Ep. 33. p. 66.

(x) Gravitati nostrae negavimus convenire ut COLLEGAE nostri jam delecti & ordinati & laudabili multorum sententia comprobati ventilandum ultra HONOREM, maledica æmulantium voce pateremur. Ep. 44. p. 85, 86.

MANY

MANY such plain Testimonies might be adduced, but I shall satisfy my self with one more, which I cannot well forbear to take notice of. It is in *Ep. 41.* I had cited it (y), to prove the Bishops Power in the Administration of the Ecclesiastical Revenues. You have it here fully on the Margent (z), and in it the Episcopal HONOUR most brightly denoting POWER or Authority. But when I cited it formerly, I omitted these words [*Nec vestra auctoritate & presentia fractus*], and did not translate these [*Et vobis acquiescere maluisse*], for this very good reason, that they neither made for nor against my purpose. For these Omissions G. R. whips me most unmercifully. He says, that to have left out these words [*& vobis acquiescere maluisse*] in my Translation, was a great Error: So great, if you'll take his word for it, that, if a School boy should make such a Version of Latin into English, he would be lashed for it. He says, that it is evident from S. Cyprian's words, that he did not act solely in this matter, but with the authoritative Concurrence of the Presbytery: And S. Cyprian blameth Felicissimus for despising the Bishops Honour, and the Presbyteries Authority; clearly insinuating, that the Difference of the Bishop and Presbyters of that time, was, that he had more Honour than they, but not more Authority (a). Now

(y) Princip. of the Cyprianic Age, p. 45.

(z) Cumque post hæc omnia nec LOGI mei HONORE motus nec vestra AUCTORITATE & presentia fractus (Felicissimus) instinctu suo quietem fratrum turbans, proripuerit se cum plurimis, ducem se factionis & seditionis principem temerario furore conte- stans, in quo quidem gratulor plurimos

fratres ab hac audacia recessisse & vobis acquiescere maluisse, ut cum Ecclesia matre remanerent, & stipendia ejus DISPENSANTE EPISCOPO perciperent, &c. *Ep. 41. pag. 80.*

(a) *Cyprian Bishop exam. § 46. p. 64, 65.*

THAT which I observe on this account of G. R's, is not that he can blunder, or that he can be inadvertent, or that he can write ignorantly, but that he can be disingenuous; for 'tis evident he had read the Epistle; how else could he have supply'd what I had omitted? Now 'tis certain, nothing below the rankest Disingenuity can prompt one who reads and understands that Epistle, to say that there is the least mention in it of the Authoritative Concurrence of a Presbytery; or that the difference between a Bishop and Presbyters, was no more, than that he had more Honour than they, but not more Authority; or that

S. Cyprian

*S. Cyprian acted in conjunction with the Presbytery; or that the Bishops dispensing the Portions of the inferior Clergy, and the poor, was nothing but his giving out Sentence as the Presbytery had determined; All which particulars are boldly asserted by G. R. For nothing can be plainer, clearer, brighter; nothing can be more obvious, more apparent, more indisputable, than 1. That the Epistle is directed not to any Senate or Society, not to any Bench or Fraternity, not to any Association or Assembly, not to any College, Court, Council, Consistory, Combination, or Convocation of Presbyters, but to Four special Delegates, Two whereof were Bishops, and the other Two Presbyters. The very words of the Direction are, Cyprianus Caldonio & Herculano Collegis, item Rogatiano & Numidico Com-presbyteris, i. e. Cyprian to Caldonius and Herculanus, his Collegues (and it is certain, after he was a Bishop, he never called any but Bishops his Collegues), as also to Rogatianus and Numidicus, his Com-Presbyters; most notoriously distinguishing the Two former, as being Bishops, from the Two latter, as being no more than Presbyters. Indeed in the very Epistle it self, those to whom it was directed are most manifestly distinguished from the *Carthaginian Clergy*. He writes to them, whoever they were, to transmit the Epistle to the Clergy at Carthage; which, what Sense had it made, if the Epistle had been directed to the Presbytery of Carthage (b)? The plain account seems to be, that the Epistle was sent to Caldonius and Herculanus, the Two Bishops, who were first in the Commission, and by them to be transmitted to Carthage.*

(b) Has literas meas fratribus nostris legite & Carthaginem ad CLERUM quoque transmittite.

Ep. 41. p. 80.

§ XIII.

(c) Cumque EGO VOS pro ME VICARIOS MISERIM, ut expungeretis necessitates fratrum nostrorum, simul etiam & ætates eorum

& conditiones & merita discernetis ut jam nunc EGO CUI CURA INCUMBIT omnes optime nossem & dignos quoque & humiles & mites ad Ecclesiasticæ administrationis OFFICIA PROMOVEREM, &c. Epist. 41. p. 79.

'TIS every whit as plain, 2. That those Four to whom the Epistle was directed, were to Act by Delegation in those matters treated of in the Epistle (c). By Delegation, I say, from *S. Cyprian*, who was then in his Retirement, and had not his Presbyters by him to consult with: From him, whose Resolutions and Determinations the Clergy of Carthage knew nothing of, till the Epistle which contain'd them, was transmitted to them. And it is particularly observable, to this purpose, that in all the Epistles which our Martyr wrote in his Re-

Retirement, it is not so much as once insinuated, that there was so much as one of his Presbyters with him when he wrote it. Sometimes he had a *Lector*, or an *Acolyte* with him, some of those inferiour Orders; never *One* Presbyter so much as named; never one syllable from which it may be so much as probably collected, that a Presbyter was with him. On the contrary, more than once fairly insinuated that they all remained at *Carthage*, or at least, that the *major* part of them were always in the City during the time of his Secession. 'Tis no less plain, 3. That S. Cyprian's Sovereign Power in the Management of both Government and Discipline, is most brightly contained in this 41st Epistle. He not only distinguishes between the HONOUR of his Place, and the Authority of those he had *delegated* (his being the Original, and theirs only a derived Authority, an Authority by Delegation) but also, in this same very Epistle, we have perfect Demonstration of his Power to promote and ordain Clergymen; to dispense the Goods of the Church; to depose or excommunicate rebellious and undutiful Clergymen, and all that adhered to them; and to do all this not only by himself, but even by *Delegates*, as he should please to chuse them. And then 4. Light it self is not clearer, that that these Phrases [*nec VESTRA auctoritate & presentia fractus*] and, [*VOBIS acquiescere maluisse*] are solely accommodable to the Four afore-mentioned *Delegates*, and have no more to do with the *Presbytery* of *Carthage*, than with the Presbyteries of *Edinburgh* or *Haddington*. All these things are so very clear in this 41st Epistle, (especially, if you take along with it the 42^d, in which the *Delegates* return to S. Cyprian an account of their Diligence) that I dare repeat my Assertion, and say, that G. R. having read this Epistle, shall never be able to purge himself of gross Disingenuity, in putting such groundless and choaking Glosses on it. And so I leave it.

II. EVEN *Dignity* it self is sometimes used by S. Cyprian, to signify not *bare Precedency*, not simple Door, or the First Hat, or the highest Seat, or the head of the Table, &c. but *Proper Power* or *Prelacy*. e. g. When he says to *Cornelius*, that the VERITY and DIGNITY of his *Episcopacy* is most clear

§ XIV.

and manifest (d). The plain meaning is, that it was found

(d) Sic enim nunc EPISCOPATUS tui & veritas pariter & DIGNITAS

apertissima luce & manifestissima, firmissima comprobatione fundata est, &c. Ep. 48. p. 91.

Sovereignty: and in many other places to the same purpose. But what needs more? *Salmasius* himself, as good a Judge of the import of words as of any thing, tells us, that both *DIGNITAS* and *HONOR* were frequently used by the *Latines* to signify the Supreme Magistrate, or at least Magistracy (e). And I remember our Martyr has somewhere so used the word Dignity (f).

(e) Sic *DIGNITAS* pro magistratu summo Latinis sæpe accipitur, ut & *HONOR*,

unde *HONORE USI* in inscriptionibus, qui magistratum gesserunt. *Wal. Mes.* p. 437.

(f) Eant nunc Magistratus & Consules five Proconsules annuæ *DIGNITATIS* in signibus & 12 fascibus gloriantur, &c. *Ep.* 37. p. 73. ubi manifestum *Dignitatem* pro potestate poni.

§ XV.

III. *CONSILIUM*, likewise, in the *Cyprianic* Dialect,

(g) § 41. p. 56 is often put for *POWER*, *G. R.* himself affirms it. He has told us, that *communicare consilium*, a Phrase used by *S. Cyprian*, *Ep.* 38. can import no less than *Authoritative Decision* (g). Nothing, indeed, more certain, than that he has blundered in the Instance: But it is enough for my present purpose, that he grants *Consilium* may signify *Power* or *Authority*, something more than *simple Dignity*; for such I take *Authoritative Decision* to be: But whatever comes of *G. R.*'s Concessions or Assertions, it is certain, that *S. Cyprian* doth so use the word, particularly *Ep.* 20. he tells the *Roman Clergy*, that they might learn by the 13 *Epistles* which he sent them, how careful he had been of his Flock, even while in his retirement; That his Counsel had not been wanting to his Clergy, nor his Exhortation to the Confessors, &c. (h) Now that by *Consilium*, there, is understood more than *Advice*, no less than *proper Authority*, is clear from those 13 *Epistles*, particularly, *Epist.* 16, 17, 19. Again, in that same 20th *Epist.* he says, he wrote Letters to the Martyrs and Confessors, wherein he endeavoured, as much as he could, by his Counsel, to reduce them to the Obedience of the Divine Precepts (i). Doubtless, he meant *Ep.* 15th. than which none contains brighter Evidences of the Episcopal Sovereignty. And *Ep.* 48. accounting how it happened, that the Presbyters of *Adrumetum*, in the absence of their Bishop, *Polycarpus*, had written to the *Roman* Presbyters and Deacons, after *Cornelius* was constituted Bishop of *Rome*; he says, they were ignorant of the COUNSEL, that is necessarily, of the Resolution, the Determination, the Decree of the Bishops (k). And *Ep.* 55. he tells *Antonianus*, that he had

Ep. 20. p. 43.

(i) Literas feci quibus Martyres & Confessores *CONSILIO* meo quantum possem ad Dominica præcepta revocarem. *ibid.*

(k) PP. &

DD. in *Adrumetina* consistentes, *Polycarpo* Co-episcopo nostro absente; ignorabant quid nobis in commune *PLACUISSET*. At ubi nos in præsentiam venimus, comperto *Consilio* nostro, ipsi quoque quod & cæteri observare cœperunt, *Ep.* 48. p. 91.

had delayed to determine any thing concerning the Lapsers, till the Persecution should abate, and Bishops might meet together, and determine what might be proper, by *common and well-pondered COUNSEL* (l), i. e. might interpose their Authority, and define in a matter of such consequence. *Cornelius* uses the same Term in the same signification of Authority, *Epist.* 49. where, accounting concerning the Reconciliation of *Urbanus* and *Sidonius*, &c. to the Church; he says there were Five Bishops present with him, *that with united COUNSEL* (i. e. plainly, with the firmer Authority) *that Reconciliation might be transacted* (m). And what can be plainer than that famous Testimony of the *Roman* Clergy, *Ep.* 30? They say they can determine nothing in the Case of the Lapsers, because, since the Death of *Fabianus*, they have not had a Bishop, who with **AUTHORITY** and **COUNSEL**, could define in such a matter (n).

(l) De eo tamen quod statuendum esset circa causam Lapsorum, distuli, ut cum quies & tranquillitas data esset, & Episcopis in unum convenire, indulgentia divina permetteret, tunc communicato & libra-

to de omnium collatione **CONSILIO STATUEREMUS** quid fieri oporteret. *Ep.* 55. p. 102.
(m) Adfuerunt etiam Episcopi quinque, qui & hodie presentes fuerunt, ut firmato **CONSILIO**, quid circa personam eorum observari deberet, consensu omnium statueretur. *Ep.* 49. p. 92.

(n) Quanquam nobis differendæ hujus rei necessitas major incumbit, quibus post excessum nobilissimæ memoriæ viri *Fabiani*, nondum est Episcopus propter rerum & temporum difficultates constitutus, qui omnia ista moderetur, & eorum qui Lapsi sunt possit cum **AUCTORITATE & CONSILIO** habere rationem. *Ep.* 30. p. 58, 59.

ONE Testimony to this purpose there is, which I must not neglect: It is in *Ep.* 18. you have it on the Margent (o). I had adduced it in my former Book, thereby to shew how much the *Carthaginian* Clergy, Presbyters as well as others, did depend on *S. Cyprian*, even while he was in his Retirement; so much as that regularly they could do nothing of moment, in the exercise of Discipline without him. I translated it tho' perhaps not so very literally, yet, as I thought, and do still think, exactly according to *S. Cyprian's* mind. My Translation was this; I wonder, dear Brethren, that you have return'd no Answers to the many Letters I have sent you; especially, considering that now in my Retirement you ought to inform me, of every thing that happens, that so I may advisedly and deliberately give Orders concerning the Affairs of the Church (p). Here *G. R.* has struck in with such a Keenness, as if for once he had got his Foot on my Neck. Let any one compare this Translation (lays he) with *Cyprian's* words — is *Linare consilium*, to give Order? it is to polish and amend his Advice, and make it more exact: He then

§ XVI.
(o) Miror vos, FF. CC. ad multas epistolas quas ad vos frequenter misi, nunquam mihi rescripsisse, cum fraternitatis nostræ vel utilitas, vel necessitas sic utiq; GUBERNETHUR, si a vobis instructi, rerum gerendarum **CONSILIIUM** LI-MARE possumus.
Ep. 18. p. 40.
(p) pag. 61.

(q) § 53.
p. 77.

in his Retirement, wills them to write often and distinctly to him, of all Occurrences, that he, as making such a Figure in their Society, might give the more accurate ADVICE about what was to be done. This is no Prelatical but a plain Presbyterian Style (q). Well! What is here to be done? Perhaps G. R. and his Friends may call it Stubbornness in me; but I am resolved not to yield without another struggle for it. And if it can be made appear, 1. That G. R.'s rendring of the Phrase [*Limare Consilium*] is not so necessarily the only right one, as that mine must needs be wrong. And 2. That mine doth indeed give the true Sense and Purpose of the Phrase, as 'tis here used by S. Cyprian, I hope all is safe enough.

§ XVII.

1. G. R.'s rendering, you see, is, that *Limare Consilium* signifies To polish and amend his Advice, and make it more exact. I have already observed, that he has not only granted, but pleaded, that the Term *Consilium* may, and sometimes must signify something more than simple Advice; than such Counsel as those who stand on a Level may give to one another; nay, Subjects may give to their Superiours. Seeing therefore, he thus grants that the word *Consilium* may signify an Order, an Act of Authority, the Stress of the present Controversie must lye on the word *Limare*; and the weighty Question comes to be, Whether this Verb *Limare* can signify neither more nor less, nor other than to polish, to amend, or to make more exact? G. R. has somewhere made me a School-Boy; suffer me therefore, as a School-Boy, to tell him, that the Origination of this Verb *Limare*, infers no such Necessity. The Verb *Limo* comes from the Noun *Lima*, which signifies a File: And, as I take it, there may be Filing where there is no design of polishing, or amending, or making more exact. Shall I tell him more? I have, in my time, observed this Verb so used by some Authors (whom right good Scholars have acknowledged to have understood the Latin right well) as it shall make G. R. sweat a little before he shall make of it, either polishing or amending, or making more exact. For instance, let him try his hand on these Verses of *Lucretius*, Lib. 5.

*Præterea pro parte sua quodcunque alid augeat
Roditur: & quoniam dubio procul esse videtur
Omniparens, eadem rerum commune sepulchrum:
Ergo terra tibi LIMATUR & aucta recrescit.*

Or these in that same Book,

*Nec nimio solis major rota, nec minor ardor
Esse potest, nostris quam sensibus esse videtur:*

Nam

*Nam quibus è spatiis tuncque ignes lumina possunt
Adjicere, & calidum membris adflare vaporem
Illa ipsa intervalla nihil de corpore LIMANT
Flammarum, nibilo ad speciem 'st contractior ignis.*

Or on these of Horace Epist. Lib. I. Ep. 14.

*Cæna brevis juvat, & prope rivum somnus in herba :
Nec lusisse pudet, sed non incidere ludum.*

Non istic obliquo oculo mea commoda quisquam

LIMAT, non odio obscuro morsuque venenat.

Or this Sentence of Phædrus's, *Si mendacium subtiliter LIMAS-
SET à radicibus, non evertisset scelere funesto domum.*

OR, if G. R. shall pretend that these Gentlemen were Poets, § XVIII.
and have used Poetic Liberties; let him turn to the Epistles of
Caius Plinius Secundus (r), and he will find him using this Argu- (r) Lib. 5.
ment to perswade his Friend Tranquillus to publish a certain Ep. 11.
Book; *Perfectum opus absolutumque est, nec jam splendet LIMA
sed atteritur*; which, as I take it, is just as much as if he had said,
Limare, to File it any more would not be to polish or amend it, or
make it more exact, but to marr it. Once more, Cicero himself,
in his little Treatise, *De optimo genere Oratorum*, discourses thus
concerning the Orator Lysias: *Est enim in multis locis Grandior;
sed quia & privatas ille plerasque, & eas ipsas aliis, & parvarum
rerum causas scripsit, videtur esse jejunior, quoniam se ipse consul-
to ad minutarum genera causarum LIMAVERIT.* Did Cicero
here mean that Lysias polished or amended, or made himself more
exact? Or rather, Is not this his plain meaning, That Lysias
did not polish or amend, but *suit*, *ply*, *attemper*, or *accommodate*
himself to those Causes which he managed? That he used nei-
ther more nor less *Filing* than was proper for such *Pleadings*? Now
it was to this sense, exactly, that I understood S. Cyprian. I con-
fess, I might have used other words in my Rendring of him; I
might have rendered him thus; that so I may *suit*, or *adapt*, or
adjust, or *attemper*, or *accommodate* my Orders to the *Exigencies*
of *Affairs*. But I was more solicitous to keep to our Martyr's
meaning than to be nice in the Choice of words; and I do still
think his meaning was plainly enough represented by the words
I used. Indeed, that S. Cyprian did not intend by the word *Li-
mare* to signifie *polishing*, or *amending*, or *making more exact*, but
that he used it in the sense of *adjusting* or *accommodating*, is plain,
both from the Use of the like Expressions observable in his Wri-
tings upon the like, and from the use he makes of the same very

(3) Plane cæterorum causas — differri mandavi, & in nostram præsentiam referri. I proceed therefore, Verb *Limare* upon other occasions. You have a *Specimen* of both on the Margent (3). The Controversie being about the true Import of Latin Words and Phrases, none but such as have some Skill in that Language, can be competent Judges in it; and therefore it is to no purpose to translate the Testimo-

niæ. pace data plures præpositi convenire in unum cœperimus, communicato etiam vobiscum consilio disponere singula & reformare possimus, *Epist.* 20. p. 43.

Propter quod & nos temperamentum tenentes, & libram Domini contemplantes — diu multumque tractatu inter nos habito, iusta moderatione, AGENDA LIBRAVIMUS, *Epist.* 54. p. 100.

— Temperamentum salubri moderatione libravimus — *Epist.* 55. p. 102.

Quando collegæ ad me venire cœperint, tractabo cum singulis plenius, ut de eo quod consulistis, figatur apud nos & rescribatur vobis firma sententia, multorum sacerdotum consilio ponderata. *Ep.* 56. p. 116.

Vide etiam supra § XIII. (c) Nihil enim illo testimonio ad hoc de quo nunc agimus explicandum, vel aptius, vel accommodatius. Sed en ipsissimum limandi verbum, ut eo Sanctus noster usus est.

— ut ea quæ circa Ecclesiæ gubernaculum utilitas communis exposcit tractare simul & plurimorum consilio examinata LIMARE possimus, *Epist.* 14. p. 31.

— ut repræsentet vobis — cum collegis meis, & — Sicut semel placuit, ea quæ agenda sunt disponere pariter & LIMARE poterimus. *Epist.* 43. p. 85.

Ad quædam disponenda & consilii communis examinatione LIMANDA, necesse habuimus — cogere & celebrare concilium — *Epist.* 72. p. 196.

§ XIX.

2. TO try whether my rendering of the Phrase *Limare Consilium*, has given S. Cyprian's true sense and purpose. I say it has, and that nothing can be plainer from the whole Sentence: Let us remember that our Martyr was then in his Retirement; and that his Presbyters and Deacons, to whom the Epistle was directed, were still in the City of Carthage; and let us read it over again, and consider it: *Miror vos, fratres carissimi, ad multas epistolas meas, quas ad vos frequenter misi, nunquam mihi rescripisse; cum fraternitatis nostræ vel utilitas vel necessitas sic utique GUBERNETUR, si à VOBIS INSTRUCTI, rerum gerendarum CONSILIUM LIMARE POSSIMUS.* What can be plainer than, that here he blames their Negligence, or rather their Undutifulness in not writing to him, upon this very score, that unless he was informed by them of the true State of Affairs, of every thing as it happened; it was not to be thought that he could accurately attemper or adjust his Orders, either to the Utility or the Necessity of the Church? But if this is plain in the words (and plain it is as what is most plain), I cannot see how it may be

be easie for G. R. to avoid this necessary Consequence, That S. Cyprian was the Supreme Governour of the Church of Carthage, of a Church in which there were many Presbyters? But I have not yet done. For

THO' the words we have read had not so plainly told us that it was their *part* to inform him, and his *Prerogative* to adjust Orders so, as that they might answer the Utility or the Necessity of the Brotherhood, as he was inform'd by them: Yet nothing plainer than this his *Prerogative* from the whole *Series* of the Epistle; especially, if we likewise take along what follows to the same purpose, in the two subsequent Epistles, the 19th. and the 20th. I shall as briefly, but withal, as fairly and ingenuously as I can, represent the Matter to the Reader. In the 18th Epistle, notwithstanding they had neglected to give him those Informations which they ought to have given him; notwithstanding the distance he was at from them; yet he gives them positive and formal Orders to regulate their Administrations in such and such Cases. Summer was begun, and, in such a warm *Climate*, that was a Season of dangerous Diseases; a Season in which commonly many Persons died. He orders therefore such of the *Lapsers* as had got Recommendations from the Martyrs, if they should be taken very ill, should forthwith be reconciled, without expecting his Presence, by any Presbyter; and if a Presbyter was not at hand, by any Deacon; that such *Lapsers* as should continue in health, should be exhorted to continue in their course of Penance, till he himself should return; and that his Presbyters and Deacons should perform all suitable Offices of Charity and Vigilancy to such of the *Audientes* (i.e. those who professed the Christian Faith, but were not yet baptized), as should be in danger of Death (†). These things, I say, he ordered, he authoritatively, and by virtue of his Power Episcopal commanded to be done; as is evident as Light it self, from the 19th Epistle; whereby we learn that his Presbyters and Deacons,

§ XX.

(†) Quoniam tamen video facultatem veniendi ad vos nondum esse, & jam aetatem coepisse;

quod tempus infirmitatibus assiduis & gravibus infestatur, occurrendum puto fratribus nostris ut qui libellos à Martyribus acceperunt & prerogativa eorum apud Deum adjuvari possunt, si incommodo aliquo, & infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, NON EXPECTATA PRÆSENTIA NOSTRA, apud Presbyterum quencunque præsentem, vel si presbyter repertus non fuerit, & urgere exitus coeperit, apud Diaconum quoque Exomologesin facere delicti sui possint; ut manu lis in poenitentia imposita, veniant ad Dominum cum pace, quam dari Martyres literis ad nos factis desideraverunt. Cæterum quoque partem plebis quæ lapsa est, præsentia vestra foveate, &c. — Audientibus etiam si qui fuerint periculo præventi & in exitu constituti, vigilantia vestra non desit, &c. *Epist.* 18. p. 40, 41.

awakened, it seems, by the former Epistle, had writ Men to him, and required from him a FORM, that is, his *Will* and *Pleasure*, his *Order* to be their *Rule*, and the *Measure* of their *Conduct*, with regard to such *Lapsers* as were too earnest and urgent to be absolved sooner than was allowed by the common course of *Discipline*; and that his return to them was, that he had given them a FORM already in his last (*i. e.* the 18th) Epistle. And indeed, in this 19th. wherein he answers their Address for a FORM, he does no more but repeat, upon the matter, that self same *Order* he had given in *Epist.* 18. and give some *Reasons*, for some of the *Branches* of it (*u*). And then,

(u) Legi literas vestras — Quoniam tamen significatis quosdam immoderatos esse & communicationem accipiendam festinanter urgere, & DE-

SIDERASTIS IN HAC RE FORMAM A ME VOBIS DARI; satis plene scripsisse me ad hanc rem proximis literis ad vos factis credo, &c. *Epist.* 19. p. 41.

§ XXI.

IF any Man shall doubt whether the Term FORMA was so understood by him and his Presbyters, as to signify his *Will* and *Pleasure*, his *Order* or *Determination*, let him know, that such is, indeed, the common current signification of it in the Dialect of the *Cyprianic* Monuments. Thus in the very First Epistle we have it Thrice over in this Sense: *The Levites of old observed this FORM* (says our Martyr) that is, *this Rule, this Law, this Ordinance, Not to involve themselves in Secular Business* (*v*). And *this FORM, this Canon, this Rule, is observed, with regard to the Christian Clergy* (*w*). And, therefore seeing Victor, contrary to the FORM, the Decree or Statute, lately made by a Synod of Bishops, has appointed Geminus Faustinus, a Presbyter, to be Tutor to his Children; let him be so and so punished (*x*). And, *Epist.* 55. *This is a FORM established by God, that every Man should bear the burden of his own Sin* (*y*). And when the Confessors, who by the Indulgence of former times, and the Custom of the Church, had got some Interest in the Reconciliation of the *Lapsers*, made their Decree concerning an extravagant *Indulgence* to be given to the *Lapsers*; this is the very Term they choose to express it by (*z*). But what needs more?

(v) Cujus Ordinationis & Religionis FORMAM Levitæ prius in lege — tenebant.

Epist. 1. p. 2.

(w) Quæ nunc ratio & FORMAM in Clero tenetur, *ibid.*

(x) Et ideo Victor jam contra FORMAM nuper

in concilio à sacerdotibus datam — *ibid.* p. 3.

(y) Nobis autem secundum fidem nostram & divinæ prædicationis DATAM FORMAM competit ratio veritatis, unumquemque in peccato suo ipsum teneri — *Ep.* 55. p. 113.

(z) Scias nos universis — dedisse pacem, & HANC FORMAM per te, & aliis Episcopis innotescere volumus, *Epist.* 23. p. 49.

LET

LET us turn to *Epist.* 20th. and there we have all made as plain as possible. There our Martyr tells the *Roman* Presbyters and Deacons, that he had given his *Orders* in Two Letters (without doubt the 18th and 19th *Epist.*) to his Clergy, concerning the *Lapsers*; and he expressly calls it a LAW which he had given them. His words are, *Nec in hoc LEGEM dedi aut me auctorem TEMERE constitui*: that is, *Neither did I RASHLY make this LAW, or constitute my self an Author in this matter.* A LAW, he says, he made; all that he denies is, that he made it RASHLY. That this is the Martyr's true meaning, is clear as Light, from the Context: For in the very next words, he gives the Reasons that mov'd him to make it: On the one hand, due Regard was to be had to the Martyrs: On the other, the Forwardness of the *Lapsers* was prudently to be repressed. Besides, the *Roman* Clergy, in a former Epistle, had given their Opinion, that such *Lapsers* as, being dangerously sick, should shew good Signs of a sincere Repentance, and be earnest to be restored to the Peace of the Church, might be absolved: And no Man franker than himself for observing One common Course and Method of Discipline: Therefore he had given such a LAW to his Clergy; and no Man could say that he had given it RASHLY, seeing he had done it on such ponderous Considerations. This, I say, is clearly *S. Cyprian's* Sense and Purpose, and might easily get a further Confirmation (if it needed it) from what is instantly subjoyned: *The Causes of the rest of the Lapsers* (says he) *I did PLAINLY or peremptorily COMMAND to be delayed and reserved TILL I MY SELF MIGHT BE PRESENT.* To command plainly or peremptorily, I think, is to give a LAW, with an *Emphasis*. You have the whole Period on the Margent (a); read it, canvas it, search it to the bottom, and confess that I have done our Martyr no Injustice. And now,

(a) Postmodum vero cum quidam de Lapsis sive sua sponte, sive aliquo incita-

TO

tore, audaci flagitatione prorumperent, ut pacem sibi à Martyribus & Confessoribus promissam extorquere violento impetu niterentur, de hoc etiam bis ad Clerum literas feci, & legi iis (nempe Lapsis) MANDAVI, ut ad illorum violentiam interim quoquo genere mitigandum, si qui, Libello à Martyribus accepto, de saculo excederent, Exomologesi facta, & manu iis in poenitentiam imposita, cum pace sibi à Martyribus promissa, ad Dominum remitterentur. Nec in hoc LEGEM DEDI, aut ME AUCTOREM TEMERE CONSTITUI: Sed cum videretur & honor Martyribus habendus, & eorum qui omnia turbare cupiebant impetus comprimendus; & præterea vestra scripta legissem, quæ huc ad Clerum

nostrum per *Clementium* Hypodiaconum nuper feceratis, ut iis qui post Lapsum infirmitate apprehensi essent, & poenitentes communicationem desiderarent, subveniretur: standum putavi & cum vestra sententia, ne actus noster qui adunatus esse & consentire circa omnia debet, in aliquo discrepet. PLANE cæterorum causas, quamvis libello à Martyribus accepto, differri MANDAVI & IN NOSTRAM PRÆSENTIAM reservari. *Epist.* 20. p. 43.

§ XXIII. TO bring this Matter to a conclusion; by what hath been said, the Reader may not only judge whether I gave *S. Cyprian's* true sense, when I rendered the Phrase *Limare Consilium* by *Giving Orders advisedly and deliberately*; but also whether by this time we have not had sufficient evidence, that a Bishop in *S. Cyprian's* time had *more Power* as well as *more Dignity* than *Presbyters*. Had not he more *Power* than they, when it was *their Part* to inform him of Occurrences, and *his Prerogative* to give *Orders* about them? Had not he more *Power* than they, who could thus prescribe *FORMS, ORDERS,* and *LAWS* to them? Who, while alone, while at such a distance from them, could *COMMAND* them, could set them *RULES* which all of them were bound to observe, peremptorily obliged to follow? Rules, which however many they were, how easily soever they might meet, and even in the Form of a *Presbytery*, yet they had no *Power* to infirm; no *Faculty* to evacuate, but only *Freedom* to obey? Had he no more *Power* than they, who could order them to absolve such and such *Lapsers* in such and such *Cases*, and by a peremptory *Mandate*, oblige them to forbear all such meddling with others, and to reserve their *Causes* to his own *Cognizance*, to *HIS OWN PRESENCE*? Was this *plain Presbyterian Stile*? Was it *Language proper* for a *Presbyterian Moderator*? I wish *G. R.* may be at pains but to read those *Three Epistles* which I have accounted for; they are but short; *One Quarter* of an *Hour* may do it; they are the 13th. 14th. 15th. by *Pamelius* his numbering. And now I proceed,

§ XXIV. IV. EPISCOPAL PROVIDENCE, is another Term observable in the *Cyprianic Monuments*; a Term most clearly importing a *Majority of Power*, as well as of *Dignity*. Thus *Epist. I.* our *Martyr* tells, that his *Ancestors, Bishops, religiously considering the dangerous Consequences of Clergy Mens undertaking Secular Administrations, did wholsomly PROVIDE and DECREE, that no Christian departing this Life, should nominate any Clergy Man to be either Tutor or Curator to Minors* (b). And

(b) Quod
Episcopi, antecessores nostri

religiose considerantes & salubriter PROVIDENTES CENSUERUNT nequis frater excelsus, ad tutelam vel curam clericum nominaret. *Epist.* 1. p. 2.

And Ep. 7. he shews, that it was peculiarly incumbent on him, to PROVIDE for the common Peace; and upon that account, tho' with great Anxiety of Mind, to be absent from his Clergy, lest his Presence should provoke the Envy and Violence of the Heathen, and he might become the occasion of Disturbance, who was peculiarly obliged to PROVIDE for the Quiet of all (c). And Epist. 20. He tells the Roman Clergy, that Tho' in Body he was absent from his Church, yet he was not wanting to it, either as to his Administrations or his Admonitions, but PROVIDED for the Brethren as well as he could, &c. (d). And Epist. 43. He excuses himself, that He could not be present with his People, because his Presence might occasion Tumults and Disorders; and it was his Duty, in especial manner, as being Bishop, to PROVIDE for the Churches Peace and Tranquillity (e). And Epist. 59. He commends Cornelius's Episcopal PROVIDENCE, in admonishing the People, &c. (f) Nay,

(c) Oportet nos tamen paci communi CONSERVARE, & interdum quamvis jam tadio animi nostri, deesse vobis, ne presentia nostri invidiam & violentiam Gentilium provocet, & sinu auctores

rumpendæ pacis, qui magis quieti omnium CONSULERE debemus. Epist. 7. pag. 14.

(d) Absens tamen corpore, nec spiritu, nec actu, nec monitis meis defui quo minus secundum Domini præcepta, fratribus nostris, in quibus possem, mea mediocritate CONSULEREM. Epist. 20. p. 42.

(e) Accessit huic tabescenti animo nostro dolor major, quod in tanta sollicitudine ac necessitate excurrere ad VOS IPSE non possum; dum per minas & insidias perfidorum cavemus ne, advenientibus nobis, tumultus illic major oriatur. Et cum paci & tranquillitati in omnibus EPISCOPUS PROVIDERE debeat, IPSE materiam seditioni dedisse & persecutionem denuo exacerbasse videatur. Ep. 43. p. 3.

(f) Quod quoniam sciam illic fraternitatem nostram VESTRA, scil. PROVIDENTIA monitam, &c. Epist. 59. p. 140.

V. AUTHORITY it self is a Term not unfrequently § XXV. used by S. Cyprian, to express the Power of Bishops, e. g. Ep. 59.

He tells Cornelius, that the Cathaginian Schismatics were already judged and condemned by the AUTHORITY, not of the African Consistories or Presbyteries, but of the African Bishops (g).

And Epist. 72 He tells Stephen, that the SACERDOTAL (i.e. the Episcopal) AUTHORITY, as well as the Unity of the Church, is very much interested in the Controversie about Heretical Baptisms (h). But of this more hereafter.

(g) Oportet utique eos quibus PRÆSUMMUS, non circum cursare, nec Episcoporum concor-

diam coherentem sua subdola & fallaci temeritate collidere—Nisi si paucis desperatis & perditis minor videtur esse AUCTORITAS EPISCOPORUM in Africa constitutorum, qui jam de illis JUDICAVERUNT, &c. Epist. 59. p. 136.

(h) Cum tua gravitate & sapientia conferendum fuit (, De Hæreticorum Baptismo, &c.) quod magis pertineat ad SACERDOTALEM AUCTORITATEM, & ad Ecclesiæ Catholice unitatem pariter & dignitatem. Ep. 72. p. 196.

§ XXVI.

(i) — Cum pro Episcopatus VIGORE & CATHE-
 DRÆ AUCTORI-
 TATE haberes PO-
 TESTATEM qua posses de illo statim vin-
 dicari; certus quod COL-
 LEGÆ tui omnes gratum habere-
 mus quodcunque circa Diaconum tuum contumeliosum SACER-
 DOTALI POTE-
 STATE fecis-
 ses, Ep 3. p. 5.
 (*) Quod si ita res est F. C. ut ne-
 quisimorum timeatur audacia & quod mali jure atque æquitate non possunt, temeritate ac desperatione perficiant, ACTUM est de Episcopatus VIGORE & de ECCLESIAE GUBERNANDÆ SUBLIMI & DIVINA POTESTATE, &c. Epist. 59. p. 126.

(-1) Cyprian, Bishop exam. § 33. p. 43.

VI. HOW often do we read of the EPISCOPAL POTESTAS, the proper Latin Term for POWER? Thus for instance, Epist. 3. S. Cyprian tells Rogatianus, that by the Vigour of his Episcopacy, and the Authority of his Chair, he had POWER to have forthwith punished his rebellious Deacon; and he might have assured himself, that all his Collegues would readily have ratified that Act of his Discipline (i) And what can be brighter than that which he says to Cornelius, Epist. 59. where he tells him, that to listen to Felicissimus and his Complices, was to throw up the Vigour of Episcopacy, and the SUBLIME and DIVINE POWER of GOVERNING the Church (k). This Phrase [The Sublime and divine Power of governing the Church] I had taken notice of in my former Book, as emphatically expressing the Episcopal Sovereignty: And G. R. even laughs at it, in his own Fashion. He says, It may agree to the meanest Member of a Presbytery (l): Yes, no doubt, to the meanest Ruling Elder; to a Weaver at the West Kirk; or a Cobbler at Curry. But I must not on every occasion return to G. R. Laughter for Laughter. To be serious therefore; When G. R. shall be at leisure to read the Epistle; and withall, so happy as to understand it; and so honest as to be ingenuous; he will confess, that he had done as wisely to have retain'd his Gravity. The plain account, in short, is this; A schismatical Party at Carthage, whereof one Felicissimus, a Deacon, seems to have been the Head, had gone (some of them) to Rome, and made such a Representation of the Controversie between S. Cyprian and them, as made Cornelius, then Bishop of Rome, to stagger a little, and turn suspicious that S. Cyprian had made wrong steps, and his Adversaries had some Advantage of him. S. Cyprian no sooner understands this, than he writes to Cornelius this 59th. Epistle, an Epistle long, indeed, but of as great Sense as Length; in the very beginning whereof he tells him, that To listen to such Tatling as those Schismaticks had endeavoured to abuse him with, was unworthy of him; that he ought not so to regard either the Tales or the Threatnings of such malicious Wretches; that at that rate, there would forthwith be an end of the Episcopal Vigour, and of the sublime and divine Power of governing the Church; that

is, if one Bishop should so readily and rashly listen to the desperate and false Accusers of another. This, I say, is clearly S. Cyprian's purpose; and nothing can be plainer to any who considers the Testimony on the Margent, than that the **SUBLIME** and **DIVINE POWER** of governing the **CHURCH**, is one and the same thing with the **VIGOUR** of **EPISCOPACY**, which, what it is, we shall see by and by (m). Divers other Testimonies to this purpose may be observed in our Progress. But neither is this all. For;

VII. SOMETIMES we have Two of those Terms conjoyned, the one to explicate or fortifie the other. Thus, *Epistle 59.* our Martyr reasons to this purpose. S. Paul paid due respect to the Jewish High-Priest, even after our Lord's Crucifixion, that is, after those Priests, by their Sacrilege, Impiety, and Cruelty, had lost all Title to the **SACERDOTAL HONOUR** and **AUTHORITY**; how unaccountable must it then be, not to pay due Submission and Regards to *Christian Bishops*, who have an undoubted Claim to such Honour and Authority? This, I say, is his Reasoning, for substance; and thus he asserts not only the **HONOUR**, but the **AUTHORITY** of the Bishops of his time. And if you read the whole *Epistle*, you'll find, that Presbyters, as much as any, were bound to acknowledge it, and pay Obedience to it (m).

§ XXVII.

Paulus, cum ei dictum esset, sic inquit in Sacerdotem Dei maledicendo? Quamvis Domino jam crucifixo, sacrilegi, & impii & cruenti illi esse cœpissent, nec jam quidquam de SACERDOTALI HONORE & AUCTORITATE retinerent, tamen ipsum quamvis inane nomen & umbram sacerdotis cogitans Paulus, nesciebam, inquit, quia Pontifex est, &c. Epist. 59. p. 123.

(m) Postmodum beatus Apostolus

VIII. WE have **HONOUR** and **POWER** conjoyn'd, as § XXVIII. both belonging to the Bishop. Thus, our Martyr tells *Antonianus*, *Epist. 55.* That *Novatianus* having separated himself from the Communion of the *Episcopal College*, and having broken *Christian Peace and Unity*, could neither have the **POWER** nor the **HONOUR** of a Bishop (n). And *Epist. 73.* he tells *Jubaianus*, that Catholick Bishops are more concern'd to con-

(n) Qui ergo nec unitatem spiritus nec conjun-

tionem pacis observat, & se ab ecclesiæ vinculo atque à sacerdotum collegio separat, EPISCOPI nec POTESTATEM habere potest, nec HONOREM qui episcopatus nec unitatem voluit tenere nec pacem, *Epist. 55. p. 112.*

sider and maintain the HONOUR of their POWER,
 (o) Nec nos *than to be solicitous about any thing that may be done by those*
 movet F. C. *Enemies of the Church, the Novatians* (o). Nay
 quod in literis
 tuis complexus es; Novatianenses rebaptizare eos quos à nobis sollicitant, quando ad nos
 omnino non pertineat quid hostes ecclesiæ faciant, dummodo teneamus ipsi POTESTA-
 TIS NOSTRÆ HONOREM, & rationis ac veritatis firmitatem, Ep. 73. p. 198.

§ XXIX.

IX. WE have POWER and AUTHORITY conjoin'd:
 Thus, Epist. 2. Our Martyr establishing the Episcopal Sove-
 raignty by divers Texts of Scripture, particularly tells Roga-
 tianus, that Solomon being *acted by the divine Spirit, witnesseth*
and teacheth what the SACERDOTAL (i. e. the Episcopal)
 AUTHORITY and POWER is, &c. (p) And Ep. 43.
 he affirms that it was a Persecution to the Church nothing
 inferior to the Decian; that the Five Presbyters who sided
 with Felicissimus in his Schism, should have attempted to evacuate
 the Determinations of so many Bishops, in the matter of the Re-
 conciliation of the Lapsed, as tending unavoidably to the Subver-
 sion of the EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY and POWER. The
 Testimony is so pregnant and emphatic, that I have given it
 fully on the Margent (q). And Epist. 59. having by many
 Texts of Scripture shewn the Obligations lying on Christians
 to obey their Bishops, he recapitulates to this purpose: *Seeing*
we have so many Evidences of the SACERDOTAL AU-
 THORITY and POWER's being of divine Appointment,
what Wretches must those be (Felicissimus and his Fraternity)
who presume to be Enemies to Bishops and Rebels to the Catholic
Church (r)?

X. THE

quingue pri-
 mores illi qui edicto nuper magistratibus fuerant copulati, ut fidem nostram subverterent—
 Eadem nunc ratio, eadem rursus everbio per quinque presbyteros Felicissimo copulatos, ad
 ruinam salutis inducitur, ut non rogetur Deus, nec qui negavit Christum—deprecetur:
 Post culpam tollatur & poenitentia, nec per Episcopos & Sacerdotes Domino satisfiat; sed
 relictis Domini Sacerdotibus, contra Evangelicam disciplinam nova traditio sacrilegæ institu-
 tionis exurgat: Cumque semel PLACUERIT tam NOBIS (*seipsum intelligit*) quam
 confessoribus & Clericis urbis (*tunc sine Episcopo Ecclesiam Romanam administrantibus*)
 item UNIVERIS EPISCOPIS, vel in nostra provincia, vel trans mare constitutis, ut nihil
 innovetur circa Lapsorum causam, nisi OMNES (*Episcopi*) in unum convenerimus, &
 collatis consiliis cum DISCIPLINA pariter & MISERICORDIA (*summe duntaxat pote-*
statis comisibus individuis) temperatum sententiam FIXERIMUS, contra hoc CONSI-
 LIUM (*i. e. statutum vel decretum*) nostrum REBELLETUR, & omnis SACERDO-
 TALIS AUCTORITAS & POTESTAS factiosis conspirationibus destruat, &c. Ep. 43.
 p. 82, 83.

(r) Cum hæc tanta & talia & multa alia exempla præcedant, quibus SACERDOTA-
 LIS AUCTORITAS & POTESTAS de divina dignatione firmatur, quales putas esse eos

qui SACERDOTUM hostes, & contra Ecclesiam catholicam rebelles, nec præmonentis Domini comminatione, nec futuri iudicii ultione terrentur. *Epist.* 59. p. 128.

X. THE same Episcopal Majority of POWER is likewise most evidently colligible from a great many Phrases which are obvious in the Cyprianic Monuments, when they are duly laid together and considered; such as EPISCOPATUM SUSCIPERE, to undertake the Office of a Bishop (s); HABERE, to have it (t); TENERE, to hold it (u); GERERE, to bear the burden of it (v); VINDICARE, to challenge it, or lay claim to it (w); EXAMBIRE, to be guilty of the Crime of AMBITUS in ascending to it (x); USURPARE, to usurp it unlawfully, to thrust ones self into it (y); EXTORQUERE, to possess it by plain Force, and lawless Violence (z); DEPONERE, to lay it down; DEPONI, to be deposed from it, or deprived of it (a); REPONI, to be restored to it (b). What less can all these Phrases import, than that a Bishoprick, in S. Cyprian's time was something other, something more than the Office of a Presbyterian Moderator? But what needs more? Our Martyr has given us an excellent Key whereby we may enter into their true Sense and Meaning; he has given us one Phrase which explains them all, viz. that to have or hold a

(s) Tum deinde post EPISCOPATUM non EXAMBITUM, nec EXTORTUM, sed de Dei qui SACERDOTES facit voluntate SUSCEPTUM, quanta in ipso SUCEPTO EPISCO-PATU suo virtus? Sic de Cornelio, notiter, *Epist.* 55. p. 104.

Novatianum

interim episcopatus exambitis & extorti notans.

(t) EPISCOPI nec POTESTATEM potest HABERE nec HONOREM, qui EPISCOPATUS, nec unitatem voluit TENERE, nec pacem. *De eodem Novatiano, Epist.* 55. p. 112.

(u) EPISCOPATUM TENERE non potest, (nempe Novatianus) *Epist.* 55. p. 112. EPISCOPATUM TENERE non debet, *Martialis, Epist.* 67. p. 173.

(v) Basilidem & Martialem — EPISCOPATUM GERERE & SACERDOTIUM Dei administrare non oportere — *Epist.* 67. p. 170.

(w) Graviter & dolenter motus sum FF. CC. quod cognoverim Fortunatianum quondam apud vos EPISCOPUM, post gravem lapsum ruinæ suæ, pro integro nunc agere velle, & EPISCOPATUM sibi VINDICARE cœpisse — *Epist.* 65. p. 162.

(x) Vide supra (s).

(y) Frustra tales (quales Basilides & Martialis) EPISCOPATUM sibi USURPARE conantur, *Epist.* 67. p. 174.

(z) Vide supra (s).

(a) Basilides — EPISCOPATUM pro conscientiae suæ vulnere DEPONENS — *Epist.* 67. p. 173.

(b) Basilides — Romam pergens, Stephanum Collegam nostrum longe positum & gestæ rei ac tactæ veritatis ignarum sedellit, ut EXAMBIRET REPONI sese injulte in EPISCOPATUM de quo fuerat iuste DEPOSITUS. *Epist.* 67. p. 173.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

Bishoprick, is to have or hold, not a Moderator's Chair, but a Church; i. e. to rule and govern it. And that which makes it the more observable, is, that it is in an instance of a Church in which there were many Presbyters, many subordinate Pastors, many subordinate Priests, many subordinate Governors. The Instance is in *Novatianus* and the Church of Rome, in which there were no fewer than Forty Six Presbyters (c).

(c) HABERE
namque aut
TENERE

ECCLESIAM nullo modo potest (*Novatianus*) qui ordinatus in Ecclesia non est, &c.
Epist. 69. p. 181. Hoc vero testimonium vide infra ; fufius.

§ XXXI.

WHEN such Terms as I have already accounted for in the preceding Sections, and such Phrases as I have given a Specimen of in the last; when such Terms and Phrases so clearly and so manifestly importing a Majority of Power lodg'd in the Persons of Bishops, in the Cyprianic Age, do so frequently occur in the Cyprianic Monuments; when they do so emphatically signify such Majority of Power, not only above the Layity, or the Lower Degrees of the Clergy, but even above Presbyters; even where Presbyters are so frequently the Persons obliged to own it, and either commended for paying it, or condemned for not paying it suitable Regards, when such things are so very evident and irresistible. I say, may it not seem strange, that any Man who can justly pretend to have read and considered those Monuments, should, nevertheless, affirm, that a Bishop, in S. Cyprian's time, had only more Dignity, but no more Power than Presbyters? In short, it is impossible for the Wit of Man to reconcile what hath been said with G. R's Notions about his Higher Dignity, but not Higher Power. No where greater Nonsense, than S. Cyprian and his Contemporaries have been guilty of, if G. R's be a true Hypothesis: And for my part, I must despair of understanding any one Sentence in their Writings; if they and he are not very far from being of the same Principles: Even tho' no more were to be collected from them than I have already represented. And yet I have not done; I have as yet Half a Dozen of Terms to be accounted for, which seem to me to be more emphatic and forcible than any I have hitherto proposed, particularly,

XI. ACTUS,

XI. *ACTUS*, is a Term, which (tho' it sometimes signifies Conversation or Behaviour) is very frequently used by S. Cyprian and his Contemporaries, to signify the Administration of the Ecclesiastical Government, the Exercise of the Authority or Power Episcopal. Thus *Epist.* 20. our Martyr tells the Roman Clergy, that seeing his Conduct in the Government of the Church of Carthage had been misrepresented to them, he had thought fit to write to them, and give them an account of his *ACTUS*, i. e. his Administration of the Government, his Discipline, and his Diligence, &c. (d). And again, in that same Epistle, alluding to 1 *Corinth.* V. 3. that is, using the Apostles Language, as being a Successor to the Apostles, in the Ecclesiastical Sovereignty; he tells them, that tho' he was absent in Body (he was then in his Retirement) yet he was present with his Flock, in Spirit, in his ADMINISTRATIONS and his Admonitions (e). And *Ep.* 25. he commits to Caldonius, a Neighbour-Bishop, to give an account to the rest of his Brethren of the Episcopal College, of an Affair, that an Agreement in their Determinations, and one Method of *ACTUS*, of Administration might be observed by all, in their respective Churches (f). He again uses the same Term to signify the same thing, in another Letter to the Roman Clergy (g). The Roman Clergy do likewise use it in an Epistle to our Martyr (b). So doth Cornelius (i). No Term, indeed, more ordinary in the Dialect of those Times. And it were easie to adduce many more Testimonies; but I shall add only other Two: He tells Antonianus, *Ep.* 55. that the Unity of the Catholick Church may be very well preserved, though every Bishop, within his own District, be Master of his own *ACTUS*, his own Administration; and accountable to God alone for the Exercise of his Government (k). To

§ XXXII.

(d) Quoniam comperi FF. CC. minus simpliciter & minus fideliter vobis renunciari quæ hic à nobis gesta sunt & geruntur necessarium duxi has ad vos literas facere; quibus *ACTUS* nostri & DISCIPLINÆ ratio redderetur, &c. *Epist.* 20. init. (e) Absens tamen corpore, nec *ACTU* nec monitis meis defui. *ibid.* p. 42. the (f) Ut apud omnes unus

ACTUS & una consensus secundum Domini præcepta teneatur. *Epist.* 25. p. 50.

(g) Post factas ad vos literas — quibus *ACTUS* noster expositus & DISCIPLINÆ & DILIGENTIÆ quantulacunque ratio declarata est — *Epist.* 27. init.

(b) Quanquam bene sibi conscius animus & Evangelicæ Disciplinæ vigore subnixus, & verus sibi in Decretis cœlestibus testis effectus soleat solo Deo iudice esse contentus, nec alterius aut laudes petere aut accusationes pertimescere, tamen geminata laude sunt condigni qui cum conscientiam sciant soli Deo debere se iudici, *ACTUS* tamen suos desiderant etiam ab ipsis fratribus comprobari, *Epist.* 30. init.

(i) Quod erat consequens, omnis hic *ACTUS* populo fuerat insinuandus — *Ep.* 49. p. 93.

(k) Manente concordia vinculo, & perseverante Catholicæ Ecclesiæ individuo sacramenti to *ACTUM* suum disponit & dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus. *Epist.* 55. pag. 110.

(l) Nam cum the same purpose he writes to *Cornelius*, *Epist.* 59. (l) and
statutum sit to *Magnus*, *Epist.* 69. (m). You have the Testimonies on
omnibus nobis the Margent, consider them impartially, and say, if you can,
& æquum sit that the Episcopal *Actus* was not quite another thing than
pariter ac ju- can agree to either *single Presbyter* or *Presbyterian Moderator*.
ctum ut unus-
cujusque causa
illic audiatur ubi est crimen admissum, & singulis pastoribus, portio gregis sit adscripta
quam regat unusquisque & gubernet rationem sui ACTUS Domino redditurus,
Epist. 59. p. 136.

(m) Rescripti, Fili carissime, ad literas tuas quantum parva nostra mediocritas valuit,
& ostendi quid nos quantum in nobis est sentiamus, nemini præscribentes quo minus sta-
tuat quod putat unusquisque præpositus ACTUS sui rationem Domino redditurus,
Epist. 69. fin. Multò sepius occurrit hæc vox, hæc significatione, imo vero eadem, etiam
Administrationes seculares exprimit noster, *Epist.* 1. p. 2. init.

§ XXXIII. XII. DISCIPLINA, Discipline, is another Term fre-
quently used to express the Episcopal Sovereignty. I mean
the Administration or Regiment of Ecclesiastical Discipline
is frequently ascribed to the Bishop in a peculiar manner.
(n) § 32. Thus, e g. besides the Testimonies just now adduced (n),
(d) (g). our Martyr, *Epist.* 59. tells of himself, that as he had been
duly promoted to his Bishoprick, and faithfully joyned to all his
Collegues, and was approved by all his People, for full Four Years,
for his Episcopal Administration, so, in the time of Peace, he had
applied himself to DISCIPLINE, and had been proscribed
(o) — Collegis in the days of Persecution, &c. (o) And in that same Epistle,
omnibus fide- we have another most observable Testimony to this purpose:
liter junctus, *Cornelius*, it seems, had complained that our Martyr, in his
plebi suæ in last Letters to him, had not given him a particular and mi-
EPISCOPA- nute account of *Fortunatus*, who had sat up, as an *Anti-Bishop*
TU quadrien- against himself, at *Cartbage*. To this our Martyr answers,
nio jam pro- that there was no just ground for such Complaint; For, *Cornelius*
batus, in quie- had sufficiently been made to know before, what *Fortuna-*
te serviens tus was; That he was One of the Five schismatical Presbyters;
DISCIPLI- that he had been excommunicated by the Sentence of very many
NÆ in tem- unblameable and wise Bishops, &c. Being certain therefore (says
pestate pro- he) that ye knew these things, and assuredly knowing that they are
scriptus, &c. registred in both thy Memory and THY DISCIPLINE, I did
Ep. 59. p. 130. not think it necessary to make any further clutter, &c. (p) So
(p) Cum hæc that
in notitia tua
esse confide-
rem & pro certo hæere memorie & DISCIPLINÆ TUÆ scirem; necessarium
non putavi, &c. *Epist.* 59. p. 132.

that tho' there were Forty Six Presbyters at Rome, yet the DISCIPLINE of that Church was Cornelius's, the Bishop's; which must needs import, at least, that he had, I shall not say, a SOLE, but I will boldly say, a CHIEF Interest in it; and the Sovereign Power of it was lodged in his Person. And Epist. 55. having accounted to Antonianus for the Reasons on which he and his Brethren, Bishops of Africa, nay, and of Italy too, had proceeded in adjusting their Determination concerning the Satisfaction and the Reconciliation of the Lapsers; he tells them, that seeing they had founded their Decree on Grounds so very justifiable, he ought not to listen to the Misrepresentations of wicked Men, &c. but it is thy Duty, (says he) as becomes a sincere Brother, and a Fellow Bishop, who loves Unanimity, not easily to receive the Suggestions of Malignants and Apostates (so he calls Schismaticks) but by a due research of our Life and DISCIPLINE, to judge of the Actions of thy modest and serious COLLEAGUES (q). It were easie to multiply Testimonies to this purpose, but these I have adduced are so pregnant; it is so manifest from them, that the Bishops of those Times had the Sovereign Power of Discipline, that 'tis needless to amass any more.

(q) Sed te oportet ut bonum fratrem atque unanimem CON-SACERDOTEM non

quid maligni atque Apostatae dicant, facile suscipere; sed quid COLLEGAE tui modesti & graves viri faciant de vitae & DISCIPLINAE NOSTRAE exploratione perpendere. Epist. 55. p. 103.

XIII. VIGOR, i. e. the Strength or Firmness of POWER, § XXXIV. the Force and Pith of Government and Discipline, is another Term frequently used by S. Cyprian, to express the Strength of the Episcopal Authority. Take a few of many Instances: He tells Rogatianus, Epist. 3. that without consulting any Man, he might have inflicted condign Punishment on his rebellious Deacon: He might have done it by the VIGOUR of his EPISCOPACY, and the AUTHORITY of his CHAIR, and might have been assured that all his Collegues would have ratified that Act of his Discipline (r).

(r) Et tu quidem honorifice circanos, & pro solita

tua humilitate fecisti, ut mallet de eo conqueri, cum pro EPISCOPATUS VIGORE & CATHEDRAE AUCTORITATE haberes POTESTATEM qua posses de illo STATIM vindicari, &c. Epist. 3. p. 5.

(s) Et iccirco consultè & cum VIGORE fecisti F. C. ABSTINENDO Diaconum, &c. Epist. 4. p. 9.
 (t) Dominus qui SACERDOTES sibi in Ecclesia sua eligere & constituere dignatur, electos quoque & constitutos sua voluntate atque opitulatione tueatur; gubernantes inspirans, ac subministrans & ad improbeciam frenandam VIGOREM & ad Lapforum fovendam poenitentiam LENITATEM, Epist. 48. p. 91.

Is this nothing but bare Dignity? Is there such VIGOUR lodg'd in the Person, or such Authority annexed to the CHAIR of a Presbyterian Moderator? And Epist. 4. our Martyr (with other Four Bishops, and some Presbyters) tells Bishop Pomponius, that he had done advisedly, and with VIGOUR, in excommunicating a certain Deacon who had lived scandalously (s). And Epist. 48. May our Lord (says our Martyr to Cornelius) who vouchsafes to choose and appoint to himself Priests (i. e. Bishops) in his Church, defend those who are chosen and appointed, by his Favour and Help: May he inspire the Governours of his Church, and furnish them with VIGOUR to bridle the Contumacy of the Wicked; and LENITY, to cherish the Repentance of Lapsers (t). Where, by the way, observe, that we have here our Martyr's Prayer to God, that he would bless Bishops with both Spirits, that of LENITY, and that of SEVERITY, the Two most notable, as well as necessary Concomitants of Sovereign Authority. Again, Epist. 59. he commends Cornelius for rejecting and repulsing Felicissimus and his Associates, with such a Plenitude of VIGOUR as was proper for Bishops to exert against the Enemies of the Church (u). And a little after he tells him, that there is an end of the EPISCOPAL VIGOUR, and of the sublime and divine Power of governing the Church, if either Fear or Favour shall prevail with him to listen to the Surmises of Schismatics (v). And the Roman Clergy use the same Term, and to the same purpose (w) (x).

EASY

(u) Legi literas tuas F. C. — quibus significasti Felicissimum hostem Christi non novum, sed jampridem ob crimina sua plurima & gravissima abstentum, & non tantum MEA sed plurimorum Coepiscoporum sententia condemnatum, rejectum à te illis esse; & cum venisset illic stipatus caterva & factione desperatorum, VIGORE PLENO QUO EPISCOPOS AGERE OPORTET, pulsum de Ecclesia esse, &c. Epist. 59. p. 126.

(v) Vide supra § XXVI. (k)

(w) Absit enim ab Ecclesia Romana VIGOREM suum tam profana facilitate dimittere, & Nervos SEVERITATIS everfa fidei Majestate dissolvere, Epist. 30. pag. 38.

(x) Mœroris nostri tam gravem sarcinam VIGOR TUUS (Cyprianum alloquitur Clerus Romanus) & secundum Evangelicam Disciplinam adhibita SEVERITAS temperat dum & quorundam improbitatem justè COERCET, & hortando ad poenitentiam viam salutis ostendit. Epist. 36. p. 69.

EASY it were to multiply Testimonies to this purpose; § XXXV. but I shall mention only One more; but such a One it is, as I can heartily recommend to G. R.'s most critical consideration. It is in *Epist. 20.* there S. Cyprian, accounting to the Roman Clergy for his careful Administration of the Government and Discipline of the Church of Carthage, especially in the weighty and uneasie Case of the Lapsers, tells them, particularly, that *he had made those of his Presbyters and Deacons who had rashly absolved the Lapsers, and restored them to the Communion of the Church, to find the dint of his EPISCOPAL VIGOUR.* He had bridled them, given them the check, severely prohibited them to pursue such Methods for the future. I have given his own words on the Margent (y): Let G. R. try them, teize them, turn them, search them, shake them, sift them as he will, and let him say, if he can, that they do not contain a Majority of Power above Presbyters, lodg'd in the Person of Bishops. But it is not only the VIGOUR of our Martyr's EPISCOPACY that is observable in them, in the general; no indeed,

(y) Item presbyteris & diaconis non defuit SACERDOTII VIGOR, ut quidam minus Disciplinæ memores & te-

meraria festinatione præcipientes, qui cum Lapsis communicare jam cœperant comprimerentur INTERCEDENTIBUS NOBIS. *Epist. 20. p. 43.*

XIV. NOTHING is, nothing can be, more evident, § XXXVI. than that they contain the Bishop's Paramount Power, his Negative Voice, his Power of prohibiting, forbidding, and discharging even Presbyters, to prosecute such Courses any further. This, I say, is most plainly and emphatically expressed by these words, INTERCEDENTIBUS NOBIS; the meaning whereof is, (and can be no other than) that he used his TRIBUNITIAN POWER, he made use of such a Power as the TRIBUNI PLEBIS among the Romans had, whereby, when they pleased, they could void all the Votes, enervate all the Consults, evacuate all the Resolves, and countermand and cassat all the Conclusions of the Senate. Whoso can with Reason pretend to any Acquaintance, (even the most ordinary) with the Roman Histories, or Customs, or Constitutions, will readily grant this to be the genuine Signification of the Verb INTERCEDERE, and that it was the ordinary word, the word in course, whereby the Power of those Tribunes was expressed. Neither can our Martyr's words

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

bear another Sense when the whole Sentence is considered. It cannot bear another Sense, I say, than this, that some of his *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, had rashly, overhastily, precipitantly, reconciled some of the the *Lapsers* to the *Communion* of the Church; that he stepped in, and for the future prohibited all such preposterous Reconciliations; and that he was enabled to do so by his *Episcopal Prerogative*: He did it by the VIGOUR of his SACERDOTIUM, his EPISCOPACY; as is evident, not only from the common use of the Word in the *Cyprianic Dialect*, but also from the whole Train of his Discourse in that 20th *Epistle*.

§ XXXVII.

NEITHER is it only here (I mean in *Epist. 20.*) that he used the Word in this Sense, but when it is observable, that in Ecclesiastical Matters, he never allows this *Power of Intercession* to any, but to God and to Bishops. To God he attributes it, indeed, and good reason for it; for in him all Power is centered; to him all Power must be referred; because, from him all Human (as well as Angelical) Power; all Authority, as well Sacred as Civil, is derived. No doubt, God is rather to be obeyed than Man. None believed this more firmly than S. Cyprian: None more bound by Principle to believe it, than those who pretend to be of the same Principles he was of, with regard to the Government of the Church. But withall, none can, without Impudence, pretend to be of his Principles, who are not willing and ready, who do not think themselves bound by Principle, to submit to Civil Authority, when they cannot comply with the Civil Constitutions; to give Passive (as they call it) when they cannot give Active Obedience. In a word, S. Cyprian was inferiour to none, in true Christian Zeal for the true Christian Doctrine of Non-Resistance. But this by the way, As he allowed this *Power of Intercession* to Almighty God (2), so did he likewise ascribe it to every Bishop in his own Diocese. He used it himself, as we have already heard. And he recommends it to Bishop Pomponius, *Epist. 4.* to put it in practice in a certain Case; forthwith to prohibit all Cohabitation of Clergymen with Virgins:

(2) Præceptis Divinis
neceffe est obsequia nostra
deserviant,
nec personam
in ejusmodi
rebus accipere;
aut ali-

quid cuique largiri potest humana indulgentia, ubi INTERCEDIT & legem tribuit
Divina præscriptio. *Epist. 67. p. 170.*

gins (a): Using this very word, and withal, fairly imply- (a) Quando ing, that so to INTERCEDE was an Act of Authority peculiar to Bishops. And Confessor *Faustus à Timida*, in his *Suffrage*, in the Venerable Council of Carthage, whereof S. Cyprian was *Præses*, imports likewise, that it was a Power peculiar to Bishops; tho' he blames some of them for misap- plying it, when they made use of it to patronize Heretical Baptisms (b). But

sexus infir-
mus, & ætas
adhuc lubrica
per omnia
frœnari à
N O B I S
(n, Episcopis)
& R E G I
debeat —
INTER-

CEDENDUM est cito talibus, dum adhuc separari innocentes possunt, quia dividi postmodum N O S T R A (Episcoporum) INTERCESSIONE non poterunt. *Epist. 4. p. 8.*

(b) Non sibi blandiantur, qui Hæreticis patrocinantur. Qui pro Hæreticis Ecclesiastico Baptismati INTERCEDIT, illos Christianos & nos Hæreticos facit. *Con. Carth. Suff. 59.*

OUR holy Martyr always, and upon all occasions, con- S XXXVIII. demns it as extravagant Impudence, as intolerable Presumption, as bare-faced Usurpation, as downright Rebellion in any Clergyman below Bishops, Presbyters as well as others, to pretend to such a Power, or to exercise it. Thus, e. g. he complains most grievously, *Epist. 34.* that some Presbyters had been so bold, as, by INTERCESSION, to hinder the Lapsers to finish and perfect their Course of Penance (c). And *Ep. 41.* he makes it an unaccountable Presumption in *Feliciſſimus*, that he had pretended to such a Power (d); nay, not only *Feliciſſimus*, but his whole Faction, and the major part of the Carthaginian Presbyters, whereof that Faction, as we shall learn hereafter (e), are condemn'd and declar'd to deserve Excommunication for assuming it, *Epist. 43. (f).* And not only

(c) Ingemif-
ceret autem &
agere peni-
tentiam quo-
modo possunt,
quorum gemitibus & lacry-
mis INTER-
CEDUNT
quidam de
presbyteris, ut
communican-
dum cum illis

temere existiment? *Epist. 34. p. 67. ubi doctissimus Fellus, hac, explicationis ergo. LACRYMIS INTERCEDUNT*] Obicem illis ponunt. Impediunt, quomodo tribuni interces- serunt, hoc est rem, pro magistratus potestate, impediverunt.

(d) Cumque ego vos pro me vicarios miserim, &c. (*vide supra § XIII c*). Ille INTERCESSERIT ne quis posset expungi, &c. *Epist. 41. p. 79, 80.*

(e) *Cap. XIII.*

(f) INTERCEDUNT precibus vestris quas nobiscum diebus ac noctibus Deo funditis; ut eum iusta satisfactione placetis; INTERCEDUNT lacrymis vestris quibus commissi delicti crimen abluitis; INTERCEDUNT paci quam vere & fideliter de Domini misericordia postulatis — Nemo, vos fratres, errare à Domini viis faciat. Nemo vos Christianos ab Evangelio Christi rapiat. Nemo filios Ecclesiæ de Ecclesia tollat. pereant sibi soli qui perire voluerunt. Extra Ecclesiam soli remaneant qui de Ecclesia recesserunt. Soli cum Episcopis non sint qui contra Episcopos REBELLARUNT, &c. *Ep. 43. p. 84. Presbyteri igitur Episcoporum statutis intercedentes, Cypriano, erant contra Episcopos REBELLES.*

(g) Unum illud (in quo non mea, nec hominum sed Dei causa est) de eorum facinore non puto esse reticendum; quod à primo statim persecutionis die, cum recitarent delinquentium facinora ferrent, & sacrificiis nefandis non tantum diaboli altaria, sed adhuc manus ipsæ Lapsorum atque ora fumarent, communicare cum Lapsis & poenitentiae agendæ INTERCEDERE non destiterunt. Clamat Deus; sacrificans Diis eradicabitur—Et INTERCEDUNT ne rogetur Deus qui indignari se ipse testatur. INTERCEDUNT ne exoretur precibus & satisfactionibus Christus qui negantem se negare profitetur. NOS in ipso persecutionis tempore de hoc ipso literas misimus (*Epist. nempe 16.*) nec AUDITI SUMUS. Concilio frequenter actò non consensione tantum nostra (*Episcoporum*) sed & comminatione DECREVIMUS ut poenitentiam fratres agerent, ut poenitentiam non agentibus nemo temere pacem daret, & illi (*quinque Presbyteri, &c.*) contra Deum sacrilegi, contra SACERDOTES DEI (*Episcopos*) impio furore temerarii, de Ecclesia recedentes, & contra Ecclesiam parricidalia arma tollentes elaborant ut opus suum Diaboli malitia consumment, &c. *Epist. 59. p. 133, 134.*

(h) Datur opera ne satisfactionibus & lamentationibus justis delicta redimantur, ne vulnera lacrymis abluantur. Pax vera (*quam Episcoporum solum erat concedere*) falsæ pacis mendacio (*quam dandi ejus juris expertes, dabant sua auctoritate presbyteri*) tollitur: salutaris finis matris novercæ INTERCEDENTE præcluditur. *ibid. p. 134.*

§ XXXIX.

XV. THAT we have every whit as good Evidences of the Bishops having the same POWER in the Church which the Roman CENSORS had in the State. That our Martyr did very well understand what was the Character and the Office of a Roman Censor, no Man, I think, will doubt, who considers either the Time when he lived, or the Employment he had pursued before he turned Christian; or the great Evidences of his singular Erudition, which are visible in his Writings. Indeed, nothing more manifest than that he always uses both Terms, CENSOR and CENSURA, as they imported such an Office. Thus e.g. in his notable Epistle to Donatus, discoursing of the Abominations that were committed among the Heathens, and the pains they were at, and the Arts they used, to conceal them; he says, that in publick, they could

could be Accusers, while in private they themselves were Criminals; and they could be CENSORS, tho' they themselves were guilty Persons (i). And in his excellent Discourse, concerning the Habit of Virgins, condemning the Arts then in use, of colouring the Hair, and painting the Face, &c. he says, he thinks it strange, that the Users of such Arts did not reflect that they were to appear before God, at the great Day, who will be sure to rebuke them with the VIGOUR of a CENSOR and a JUDGE (k). Now that which I observe is, that we do not only most frequently read of the Bishops having the Power of CENSURES, the CENSURA SACERDOTALIS, &c. but on all occasions almost, we have this Power of theirs, represented in the very Terms and Style usual among the Romans, for expressing the Power of their CENSORS; that is, we have it represented with all its awful Concomitants, Gravity, Severity, Stayedness, Resolution, &c. nay, the very putting a Mark on One, NOTING him, &c. All which laid together, give us the true Purtraiture of a CENSOR: Whoso is capable, may competently judge in this matter, by the Testimonies on the Margent (l). Further yet,

(i) Idem in publico accusatores, in occulto, rei: in semetipsum CENSORES pariter & nocentes. Tom. I. p. 6.

(k) Non me tuis, oro, quæ talis es, nec cum resurrectionis dies venerit, artifex tuus te non recognoscat, & ad sua præmia & promissa venientem removeat, & excludat INCREPANS vi-gore CENSORIS & JUDICIS, &c.

Tom. I. p. 100.

XVI. ONE

(l) Si virgines inventæ fuerint, accepta communicatione ad Ecclesiam admittantur, hæc tamen INTERMINATIONE, ut si ad eosdem masculos postmodum reversæ fuerint — GRAVIORI CENSURA EJICIANIUR, nec in Ecclesiam postmodum facile recipiantur. Epist. 4. p. 9.

Animadvertimus te (Cyprianum alloquuntur Confessores Romani) congruente CENSURA & eos dignè OBJURGASSE, qui immemores delictorum suorum pacem à PRESBYTERIS, per ABSENTIAM TUAM, festinatâ & præcipiti cupiditate extorsissent; & illos (n. presbyteros Episcopali censura pariter obnoxios) qui sine respectu Evangelii, sanctum Domini canibus, & Margaritis porcis, profana facilitate donassent, &c. Epist. 31. p. 63.

Omnia penitus potestis inspicere, lectis libellis (De Lapsis, utique; & De Unitate Ecclesiæ) quas hic nuper legeram, & ad vos quoque legendos pro communi dilectione transmiseram, ubi Lapsis nec deest CENSURA quæ INCREPET, nec medicina quæ sanat, &c. Epist. 54. p. 100.

Et quidem primum quoniam de MEO quoque ACTU motus videris, ME A apud te persona & causa purganda est, ne me aliquis existimet à proposito MEO, LEVITER recessisse; & cum Evangelicum vigorem primò & inter initia defenderim, postmodum VIDEAR animum MEUM à DISCIPLINA & CENSURA priore flexisse, &c. Ad Antonianum Epist. 55. p. 101.

Et quidem apud Antecessores nostros quidam de EPISCOPIS dandam pacem mœchis non putaverunt, & in totum, poenitentiae locum contra adulteria clausurunt, non tamen à COEPISCOPORUM suorum COLLEGIO recesserunt, aut Catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitatem vel duritiæ, vel CENSURÆ suæ obstinatione ruperunt. Epist. 55. p. 110.

Quod si de COLLEGIS aliquis obstitit, qui urgente certamine pacem fratribus & fororibus non putant dandam, reddet ille rationem in die judicii Domino vel IMPORTUNÆ CENSURÆ vel inhumanæ duritiæ suæ. *Epist.* 57. p. 119.

Legi literas tuas, F. C. — & dilectionis fraternæ & Ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ, & SACERDOTALIS CENSURÆ satis plenas, &c. *Epist.* 59. p. 126.

Sed non ideo, F. C. relinquenda est ecclesiastica disciplinæ aut SACERDOTALIS solvenda CENSURA quoniam convitiis infestamur, &c. *ibid.* p. 127.

Jam causa eorum (*Felicissimi, &c.*) cognita est, jam de eis dicta sententia est nec CENSURÆ congruit SACERDOTUM (*i. e. Episcoporum*) MOBILIS atque INCONSTANTIS ANIMI LEVITATE reprehendit, &c. *ibid.* p. 137. Non Fabritius, non ipse Cato censorius censorem aptius apertiusve depinxisset.

Cui rei nostrum est subvenire F. C. qui divinam clementiam cogitantes & GUBERNANDÆ ECCLESIAE LIBRAM TENENTES sic CENSURAM VIGORIS (*utique Episcopalis*) peccatoribus exhibemus, ut tamen Lapsis erigendis & curandis vulneratis, bonitatis & misericordiæ divinæ medicinam non denegemus *Ad Stephanum de Marciano Episcopo Arcelatensi, Epist.* 68. p. 177.

Epist. item 76. p. 230. *Episcopos quosdam cordiculus exosculatur quod inter alia summe virtutis experimenta, in disciplina SEVERITATE, CENSURAM conservassent: episcopos, inquam, nam presbyteri, & diaconi, licet, ceterique fratres in metallo constituti in epistola inscriptione reperiantur, id tamen quod protulimus ad episcopos solos esse referendum, ex epistola totius filo manifestum est.*

Epist. item 59. p. 132. *Phrasi censoria vulgatissima utitur noster, dum privatum Lambesitanum ait Fabiani & Donati, illius Romæ, hujus Carthaginis, episcoporum quondam fuisse sententiā SEVERISSIME NOTATUM.*

§ XL.

XVI. ONE other Term there is, not unfrequently used by S. Cyprian, to signify the Power Episcopal, than which he himself seems to have deem'd none more significant or proper to express the fullest, the highest, the unconfin'dest Power. It is *LICENTIA*; this Term, in the Cyprianic Dialect, signifies a Power of doing things at pleasure, without being accountable to, or dependent on any Superiour. And, indeed, this is the proper import of the word, if we may believe the *Etymologists* (m). This Term our Martyr chooses, to express that great, that *Heaven-born* Dominion, that most heroic Conquest, which the regenerate Man obtains over the Devil, the World, and his own Corruptions (n). This is the Term he singles out to signify that incomparable Freedom, those are blessed with who receive the *Holy Spirit*: And that we may the better understand his meaning, he chooses another Term to explain it by; the Term *POTENTATUS*; a Term coin'd, as it were, and contriv'd on purpose to signify Dominion

(m) Licentia proprie est facultas secundum quam aliquid LICET ut quis faciat vel omittat, vel impediat.

(n) Cæterum si tu innocentia, si justitiæ viam teneas, si illapsa firmitate vestigii tui

incedas, si in Deum totis viribus, & toto corde suspensus, hoc si tantum quod esse coepisti, tantum tibi ad LICENTIAM datur, quantum spiritualis gratiæ augetur. *Ad Donatum*, p. 3.

Dominion in its greatest Height and Elevation (o). This (o) — Ac-
Term *LICENTIA* he chooses to express our Saviour's stu- ceptus spiritus
pendous and astonishing Power of casting out Devils; of fix- LICENTIA
ing the Nerves of Paralyticks; of purging Lepers; of resto- potitur —
ring Eyes to the blind, and Feet to the Cripple; of raising Quantus hic
the Dead, and exercising a *despotic* Power over all the Ele- animi
ments, &c. (p) And he seems to have known no Term POTENTA-
fitter, or more emphatic for expressing the paramount, the TUS quanta
peerless, the uncontroled and unconfined Power of the Ro- vis est? Non
man Emperours (q). Now, tantum ipsum
esse subtra-
ctum perni-
ciosis contacti-

bus mundi, ut qui expiatus & purus, nulla incurfantis inimici labe capiatur, sed adhuc for-
torem esse & majorem viribus fieri, ut in omnem adversarii grassantis exercitum IMPE-
RIOSIO JURE DOMINETUR, *ibid.* p. 4.

(p) Itaque cum Christus Jesus — verbo & vocis imperio Dæmonia de hominibus ex-
cuteret, paralyticos restringeret, leprosos purgaret, illuminaret cæcos, claudis gressum da-
ret, mortuos rursus animaret, cogeret sibi elementa famulari, servire ventos, maria obedire,
inferos cedere; Judæi qui illum crediderant hominem tantum de humilitate carnis & corpor-
is, existimabant magnum de *LICENTIA POTESTATIS*. *De Idol. Vanit.* p. 16.

(q) Quos honores putas esse, quos fasces, quam affluentiam in divitiis, quam potentiam
in castris, in magistratu purpuræ speciem, in *PRINCIPATU LICENTIÆ POTESTA-*
TEM, malorum blandientium virus occultum est; aridentis nequitie facies quidem læta,
sed calamitatis abstrusæ illecebrosa fallacia. *Ad Donatum*, p. 7.

THIS very Term our Martyr uses on divers occasions, to § XLI.
signifie the *sovereign*, the *paramount*, the *peerless* Power of Bi-
shops: By necessary consequence, on almost all Occasions on
which he compares the Crime of Rebelling against Bishops, to
the crying Sin of *Core*, *Dathan*, and *Abiron*; e. g. in that nota-
ble *Synodical Epistle* (*Epist.* 67.) whereof no doubt he was the
Pen-man, one of the great Arguments insisted on against
Martialis and *Basilides* their *resuming* the Episcopal Office,
after they had been *deposed* as *Laspers*, and their Bishopricks
were filled, is, that such an Attempt was like the Sin of
Core, *Dathan*, and *Abiron*, who *assumed to themselves* a *LICEN-*
TIA, a *Sovereign Power of sacrificing*, in opposition to Aaron the
Priest (r). And *Epist.* 73. written to *Jubaianus*, he com- (r) Quod
pares the Crime of Hereticks and Schismaticks, who pre- item in nume-
sume to baptize without dependence upon, or in opposition ris manifestari
to their Bishops, to the *unballowed Course* of *Core*, *Dathan*, invenimus,
and & *Dathan* & quando Core
Abiron contra

Aaron sacerdotem sacrificandi sibi *LICENTIAM* vindicarunt, &c. *Episc.* 67. p. 171.

(s) Nam & Core, & Dathan, & Abiron contra Moysen & Aaron sacerdotem sacrificandi sibi LICENTIAM vindicare conati sunt, &c.
Ep. 73. p. 201.

and Abiron, who usurped *LICENTIA SACRIFICANDI*, an independent Power of sacrificing, in opposition to Moses and Aaron the Priest (s). From both these Passages, I say, it follows by necessary consequence, that Bishops, and Bishops alone, had the *LICENTIA*, the Sovereign Power of governing the Church, &c. That they had the Original and Independent Power; and all Exercise of Power, within their Districts, was sacrilegious and schismatical, which was not performed in Dependence on them, and for which the Exercisers refused to account to them. Nothing clearer, than that this is the result of our Martyr's reasoning in both Cases. *Basiliides* and *Martialis* would be guilty of the Sin of Core, Dathan, and Abiron, if they should attempt to resume the Episcopal Office. Now that *Felix* and *Sabinus* were duly and canonically possessed of those Bishopricks which they had holden before they lapsed and were deposed. And all *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* who presumed to baptize, &c. were likewise guilty of the Sin of Core, Dathan, and Abiron, because they did so in independence on the Bishop of the District. This is the reasoning: And the Consequence is unavoidable, namely, that Bishops, and none but Bishops, have the *LICENTIA*, the Sovereign, the Absolute, the Independent Power of Church Government: And who so besides them, assumes any such *LICENTIA*, to perform any Acts relating to Discipline or Government within their Districts, without depending on them, or being ready to account to them, are *ipso facto* involved in the Guilt of Core, Dathan, and Abiron; and so obnoxious to their Punishment. But

§ XLII.

THE most considerable Passage to the purpose is in *Epist. 69*. *Magnus* had written to our Martyr, craving his Sentiment concerning heretical and schismatical Baptisms, and particularly, the Baptisms of the *Novatianists*. And our Martyr gives it very plainly and peremptorily; he concludes all such Baptisms null and nought; not Sanctifications but Profanations; not profitable but pernicious, &c. And one of the main Reasonings he insists on is, that even the *Novatianists*, as much as they pretended to profess all the Articles of the True Christian Faith, were as bad, if not worse than Core, Dathan, and Abiron, &c. Take it in his own Words, at least, in his own Sense, as near as I can give it: Core, Dathan, and Abiron (says he) owned the same God whom Aaron and Moses owned; they professed to

own the same Law, and the same Religion; and they invocated the only and true God who was to be worshipped and invocated: Nevertheless, because they attempted an higher Ministry than their Place or Station allowed them, and assumed to themselves a LICENCE of Sacrificing, in opposition to Aaron the Priest, who was possessed of the lawful Priesthood, by God's Vouchsafement and Appointment, they were smitten of God, and punished in an instant, for their unhallowed Attempts. Neither could their Sacrifices be good in Law, or any way available, because they were offered unlawfully, and against the Authority of the Divine Ordinance. — And yet these Men had made no Schism, they had not GONE OUT (that is, had not erected another Altar, and form'd another Communion) nor had they foolishly and in an hostile manner stood up against God's Priests, as those (Novatianists) have done, who have divided the Church, and rebelled against Christ's Peace and Unity; having presumed to set up to themselves an [Episcopal] Chair, and assume an [Episcopal] Primacy and Vindicate to themselves LICENTIAM BAPTIZANDI, atque OFFERENDI, an unaccountable and independent, that is, the Sovereign Power of the Christian Sacraments. How can such perform what they undertake? How can they obtain any thing of God by their unlawful Presumptions, who, against God undertake that which is not lawful for them; [quod eis non LICET] that for which they have no Power, no Allowance, no Commission? Wherefore they, whosoever they are, who patronize Novatianus, or the like Schismaticks, do in vain contend that, there [ILLIC, in that, or any other Schismatical Communion] any Man can be washen, or sanctified by salutary Baptism, where it is certain the Baptizer has not (tho' he pretends to it as Novatianus doth) the SOVERAIGN POWER of Baptism (t).

(t) Nam &
Core & Dathan
& Abiron cum
IN sacerdote Aa-
ron & Moyse

eundem Deum noverant, pari lege & religione viventes, unum & verum Deum qui colendus & invocandus fuerat, invocabant. Tamen quia LOCI sui ministerium transgressi, contra Aaron sacerdotem qui sacerdotium legitimum dignatione Dei atque ordinatione perceperat. SACRIFICANDI sibi LICENTIAM vindicaverunt divinitus percussi poenas statim pro illicitis conatibus penderunt. Nec potuerunt rata esse & proficere sacrificia irreligiose & illicitè contra jus divinæ dispositionis oblata. — Et tamen illi schisma non fecerant, nec FORAS egressi contra Dei sacerdotes imprudenter & hostiliter rebellaverant; quod nunc hi [Novatianenses, scil.] ecclesiam scindentes, & contra pacem & unitatem Christi rebelles, CATHEDRAM sibi constituere & PRIMATUM assumere & baptizandi atque offerendi LICENTIAM vindicare conantur. Quomodo perficere quæ agunt, aut impetrare

aliquid illicitis conatibus de Deo possunt, qui contra Deum, quod eis non LICET moliantur? Quare qui Novatiano sive cæteris ejusmodi schismaticis patrocinantur, frustra contendunt baptizari & sanctificari ILLIC aliquem salutari baptismo posse, ubi constat baptizantem baptizandi LICENTIAM non habere. *Epist. 69. p. 183, 184.*

§ XLIII. IN which Discourse we have these things observable.

I. That the Crime of *Core, Dathan, and Abiron*, consisted in their assuming to themselves an absolute, an independent, *i. e.* a Sovereign Power of Sacrificing, in opposition to *Aaron* the Priest; which Sovereign or Independent Power our Martyr calls *LICENTIA SACRIFICANDI*. Nothing plainer from the Testimony. It was a Power higher than could agree to *Levites* above their *LOCUS* and their *MINISTERIUM*, their *Place* or *Degree*, and their *Ministry*: And it was a Power [*contra*] in opposition to, not in dependence on *Aaron*, who alone was invested with the Sovereign Sacerdotal Power by Divine Ordination. So much, as I said, is plain from the Testimony. But tho' it had not been so plain here as, you see, it is; it might have been made appear, beyond all contradiction, from the same very Reasoning as our Martyr insists on it in other Terms, on another occasion. It is in *Epist. 3.* where having adduced this Instance of *Core, Dathan, and Abiron*, he expressly tells us, that their Crime consisted in this, that they were so haughty, and so raised their Crests, that they were bold to *EQUAL* themselves (to act as independent on, and standing on a level) with the High Priest, whom God had appointed to be over them (u). So that the *LICENTIA SACRIFICANDI*, which they usurped, was necessarily a *Supreme Power* as *Aaron* had, but none could have but *Aaron*. II. It is every whit as clear, that the *LICENTIA BAPTIZANDI* atque *OFFERENDI* usurped by *Novatianus*, was a Power of the same nature with that usurped by *Core, Dathan, and Abiron*; that is, a *Sovereign and Independent Power* of the *Christian Sacraments*. The Solidity of the Reasoning requires this; as must be obvious to every body. Indeed, without supposing this, the reasoning is not only naught, and inconcludent, but notoriously ridiculous. But these two things being thus

(u) *Celebri illo, Deut. 17. 12. ad Episcoporum auctoritatem stabilendam adducto, sic pergit noster. Et ut sciamus hanc Dei vocem cum vera & summa maiestate processisse, ad honorandos & vindicandos SACERDOTES suos (n, Episcopos) cum adversus Aaron sacerdotem tres de Ministris, Core, & Dathan, & Abiron, ausi sunt superbiisse & cervicem suam extollere & sacerdoti PRÆPOSITO se ADÆQUARE, hiatu terræ absorpti, &c. Epist. 3. pag. 5.*

lo

so clear, it must needs follow, III. That the Crime of *Novatianus* was, that he usurped *LICENTIAM BAPTIZANDI* at-
que *OFFERENDI*, a Sovereign Power of the Christian Sa-
craments; a Power to administer them without depending up-
on, or being accountable to *Cornelius*, or whoever was Bishop
of *Rome* when this Epistle was written; who alone, by Divine
Appointment, was (within his own District) invested with
that *LICENTIA*, that Power Sovereign and Independent.

BUT it is not only to be collected by irrefragable Conse-
quences, that S. *Cyprian* ascribed to the Bishop this *LICENTIA*,
this Absolute and Independent or Sovereign Power, Twice I remem-
ber he ascribes it to him most formally and expressly, particu-
larly *Epist.* 3. having fully asserted Bishop *Rogatianus's* Power
to punish his rebellious Deacon, and that either by *Deposition*
or *Excommunication*; he subjoyns, that it were indeed much more
to be desired that such Delinquents should do Penance, and make
Satisfaction: For we wish and desire (says he) rather to over-
come the Reproaches and Injuries of every Man by merciful Pa-
tience, than to punish them *SACERDOTALI LICENTIA*, by the
Sovereign Power of our Episcopacy (v). The other Passage (v) Magis e-
(and a very remarkable one) we have in our Martyr's ex-
cellent Discourse at the opening up of the venerable Council
of *Carthage*, Anno 256. where, encouraging every Bishop there
present to give his Sentiment frankly and freely, without Fear,
and without Reserve; he gives this Reason for it, That none of
them (neither himself nor any other) pretended or could pretend
to be Bishop of Bishops; or by a tyrannical Terrour, to force his
COLLEAGUES to the necessity of Obedience; seeing every Bishop,
by virtue of the *LICENTIA*, the Absoluteness and Independency of
his Power, was intirely Master of his own Resolutions, and could
no more be judged by others, than he could judge others (w). In
which Testimony we have not only the original Equality of
Bishops most plainly and distinctly asserted, and thereby the
Bishop of *Rome's* Pretensions most manifestly subverted, but
also the Episcopal Authority or Power most expressly affirmed

§ XLIV.

(v) Magis e-
nim optamus
& cupimus
contumelias &
inurias singu-
lorum clemen-
ti patientia vin-
cere quam
SACERDO-
TALI
LICENTIA
vindicare.
Ep. 3. p. 7.

(w) Neque
enim quis-
quam nostrum
Episcopum se
Episcoporum
constituit aut
to
Tyrannico ter-
rore ad obse-

quendi necessitatem COLLEGAS suos adigit, quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro *LICEN-
TIA* libertatis & potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit,
quam nec ipse judicari potest, sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu
Christi qui UNUS & SOLUS habet potestatem, & præponendi nos in Ecclesiæ suæ GU-
BERNATIONE & de ACTU nostro judicandi. Tom. I. p. 229, 230.

to be *absolute and independent* ; expressly affirmed, I say, in these words [*Quando habeat OMNIS EPISCOPUS pro LICENTIA LIBERTATIS & POTESTATIS SUÆ ARBITRIUM PROPRIUM.*] And this leads me to another *Term* or *Phrase* whereby S. Cyprian sometimes expresses the *Sovereign Power* of Bishops. It is

§ XLV.

XVII. *THIS Liberum Arbitrium*, which our Martyr ascribes to every Bishop ; and which manifestly imports, that every Bishop, within his own *District*, was fully Master of his own Resolutions and Determinations, and independent in his Government ; that is, had no *Superiour* on Earth to whom he was *accountable* ; and in all Cases not determin'd by the Laws of God or the Canons of the Church, might administer Discipline, and perform Acts of Government, without being bound to answer to any Man or Society of Men for it. Nothing clearer in all the *Cyprianic* Monuments, as appears not only from the preceding Testimony, but also from these other Two which you have on the Margent (x) (y).

(x) Cæterum scimus quosdam quod semel imbibere, nolle deponere, nec

propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter COLLEGAS pacis & concordie vinculo, quædam propria quæ apud se sint semel usurpata retinere: Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus, cum habeat in Ecclesiæ administratione, VOLUNTATIS SUÆ LIBERUM ARBITRIUM UNUSQUISQUE PRÆPOSITUS, RATIONEM ACTUS SUI DOMINO REDDITURUS. Hæc noster ad ipsum Romanum Stephanum & ipsum tunc temporis duntaxat COLLEGAM, *Epist.* 72. p. 198.

(y) Hæc tibi breviter pro nostra mediocritate rescriptimus, F. C. nemini præscribentes, quo minus unusquisque EPISCOPORUM quod putat faciat, HABENS ARBITRII SUI LIBERAM POTESTATEM. Ad Jubaianum *Epist.* 73. p. 209, 210. *sed de hoc postea fortassis fusi.*

§ XLVI.

THUS I have collected and represented **XVII.** *Terms* and *Phrases* frequently occurring in the Monuments of the *Cyprianic Age*, whereby it is evident that by the received Principles of that Age, a Bishop had not only *more Dignity*, but even *more Power* than *Presbyters*. Let any Man (even G. R. himself, on condition he will for once be ingenuous) lay them together ; let him lay together, if he will, only the *last Seven*, nay, only the *last Four* of these *Seven* ; the Bishops *Negative Power* I mean, or *Power of Intercession* ; his *Power of Censures* ; his *unconfined and independent Power* (or, in other words, his *tribunitian*, his *censorian*, his *imperial Powers*) and his *Power of governing* his own Church according to his own *Arbitriment*, and then let him say, if he can, that a Bishop in Cyprian's Time had only *more Dignity* than *Presbyters*, but not *more Power* or *Authority*.

Let

Let him reconcile what hath been so fully proposed and proved with the *Idea* of a *Presbyterian-Moderator*.

BUT perhaps G. R. will have in readiness to say, that all this is but Arguing from Words, and so can never amount to any considerable Evidence. I wish he may not so trifle. For 'tis plain to any who shall seriously consider the Testimonies I have adduced, that the Force of my Arguments does not at all depend on the meer import of Terms or Phrases precisely considered, but on the import of them as they were used to signify the Bishops *Superiour Power* in so many weighty Cases of Government and Discipline, and that, many times, even where Presbyters were the Persons mainly concerned : By necessary consequence, to say that all has been but arguing from words, must be to *trifle* most notoriously. But least he should so *trifle*, proceed we to the next thing proposed.

§ XLVII.

C H A P. VI.

G. R.'s *Second Main Subterfuge*, viz. That a Bishop, in S. Cyprian's Time, had only MORE DIGNITY, but not MORE POWER than Presbyters, *further overthrown*, by producing a Specimen of Real and Substantial Prerogatives lodg'd in the Persons of Bishops of that Age, as *contra-distinct* from Presbyters.

THE next thing I undertook to make appear was, That the Bishops of the *Cyprianic Age*, as *contra-distinguished* from Presbyters, were in possession of such substantial *Prerogatives* as may justify the *Propriety* of the *Terms* and *Phrases* already insisted on ; and make it evident, that those *Terms* and *Phrases*, importing a Majority of Power in Bishops above Presbyters, imported no more than was naturally and necessarily consequential to such *Prerogatives*. I undertake only to give a Specimen of them. I doubt not, the Monuments of the *Cyprianic Age*, well sifted, may afford more ; as they may likewise of such *Terms* and *Phrases* as I have already accounted for. I call them *Prerogatives* ; but I am not to engage in Disputations about the *Propriety* or the *precise Signification* of the Name. As it is enough

§ I.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

enough to my purpose, so it is to me, if I shall insist on nothing but what may be properly denominated a *Prerogative*, or may, at least, be reduced to *one* by fair and just consequence. This being premised, for preventing of unnecessary Jangle, proceed we to produce our *Specimen*. And

§ II.

(a) Memi-
nisse autem
diaconi debent
quoniam
APOSTO-
LOS, id est,
EPISCOPOS
& PRÆPO-
SITOS Domi-
nus elegit;
diaconos au-
tem post ascen-
sum Domini
in coelos APO-
STOLI consti-
tuerunt sibi
EPISCOPA-
TUS SUI &
ecclesiæ mini-
stros: Quod si

NOS aliquid audere contra Deum possumus qui EPISCOPOS facit, possunt & contra NOS audere diaconi à QUIBUS sunt. Et ideo oportet diaconum de quo scribis agere audaciæ suæ pœnitentiam, & honorem SACERDOTIS agnoscere, & EPISCOPO PRÆPOSITO suo plena humilitate satisfacere. Hæc sunt enim initia hæreticorum & ortus atque conatus scismaticorum male cogitantium, ut sibi placeant & PRÆPOSITUM superbo tumore contemnant. *Epist. 3. p. 6.*

I. BY the Principles of the *Cyprianic* Age, Bishops as such, Bishops as contra-distinguished from Presbyters, were believed to be SUCCESSORS to the APOSTLES in the Supreme Power Ecclesiastical. Nothing more clearly demonstrable from the Monuments of that Age. S. Cyprian, in *Epist. 3.* written to Bishop Rogatianus, encouraging him to make his rebellious Deacon feel the dint of his Episcopal Power, discourses thus, *Deacons ought to remember that our Lord choosed APOSTLES, that is, BISHOPS and RULERS; and that it was after our Lord's Ascension that Deacons were made by the APOSTLES for the Service of their EPISCOPACY, and of the Church: Wherefore, as WE (Bishops) ought to do nothing against God who makes BISHOPS; so neither ought Deacons to do any thing against US (Bishops) by whom they are made. It is necessary, therefore, that your Deacon, concerning whom you write, should acknowledg the Honour of the PRIEST, and make Satisfaction to the BISHOP, his Superiour, in the humblest manner, &c (a).* What can be plainer than 'tis, here, that BISHOPS, AS SUCH, are the Apostles SUCCESSORS?

§ III.

I know, it hath been said here by some of our Presbyterian Adversaries, that S. Cyprian more than once calls Presbyters PRÆPOSITOS, that here, he distinguishes between EPISCOPOS and PRÆPOSITOS; so that by PRÆPOSITOS, Presbyters are to be understood, and by consequence he makes Presbyters as well as Bishops, Successors to the Apostles. But this seeming Difficulty is soon removed; for it is indeed a palpable (not to call it a wilful) Mistake, to say that S. Cyprian does here distinguish between *Episcopos* and *Præpositos*. He only uses Two Words to signify the same thing. Nothing more ordinary in the *Cyprianic* stile, than such Copulations and Synonyma's. Hundreds of Instances might be adduced: You have half

half a Dozen on the Margent for a Sample (*b*). We have a remarkable one in the same Period, in these words [*Honorem sacerdotis agnoscere, & Episcopo præposito suo plena humilitate satisfacere.*] where both Terms, *Sacerdos* and *Episcopus præpositus*, signifie the same Person; and both Phrases [*Honorem sacerdotis agnoscere*], and [*Episcopo præposito suo plena humilitate satisfacere.*] signifie the same thing; the one being only exegetic of the other. In short, that in the Instance before us, [*EPISCOPOS & PRÆPOSITOS*] the same Persons are signified, or Persons of the same Order, is plain from the whole Context; nay, from the Design of the whole Epistle. Is not the purpose of S. Cyprian's Reasonings, all the Epistle over, and particularly in this Period, to shew what a dutiful Subjection Deacons owe to their Bishops? Is not this his Argument, That our Lord instituted Bishops in the Institution of Apostles, whereas Deacons were afterwards instituted by the Apostles, who were Bishops; and therefore such an humble Subjection is due from Deacons to Bishops? What then should have brought Presbyters into the reckoning? What should have haled them into the reasoning, who were so in no wise interested in the Design of it? Into the Premises, who were not concerned in the Conclusion? Besides, is it not plain from the whole Series of the Reasoning, that our Martyr meant only such *Præpositi* as made or ordain'd Deacons? And who can have the confidence to say, that either the Canons or the Customs of the Cyprianic Age allow'd Deacons to be ordain'd by Presbyters? Doth not S. Cyprian, all over the reasoning, use the two Terms *Episcopus* and *Præpositus* indiscriminately, and as Terms equivalent? And then consider the Testimony, as you have it above on the Margent, and you'll find it clear as Light, that by *PRÆPOSITOS*, he meant those who were Principles of Unity to their respective Churches: Such *PRÆPOSITI* as of whom the Contempt had such a natural Tendency towards Heresies and Schisms. But who can say that this could agree to Presbyters by the Principles of S. Cyprian and his Contemporaries? *TOS & SACERDOTES vocare*--Ep. 66. p. 167. *Sed de hoc testimonio vide infra § VII.—Episcopatum gerere & Sacerdotium Dei administrare*, Ep. 67. p. 170.—*Nos quantum in nobis est, propter Hæreticos cum Collegis & Coepiscopis nostris non contendimus*, Epist. 73. p. 210.

(*b*) Nec putent sibi vitæ aut salutis consistare rationem, si EPISCOPI & SACERDOTIBUS solutemperare noluerint, Ep. 4. p. 9. Solos autem Episcopos utraque voce denotari, ex sequentibus est manifestissimum.

—Certè quod PRÆPOSITIS & SACERDOTIBUS convenit. —Ep. 45. p. 87.

—Sic nunc EPISCOPO confessore Domini & SACERDOTE redeunte— Ep. 61. p. 145.

—Sed & COLLEGARUM quoque & CONSACERDOTUM nostrorum— Ep. 62. p. 147.

—Quis hic est superbiæ tumor—ad cognitionem suam PRÆPOSITI—

THE same Prerogative is every whit as clearly asserted, Ep. 45. For, there, having accounted to Cornelius concerning the Measures the African Bishops had taken, and observed, with regard to the Controversie between him and Novatianus; and particularly

§ IV.

(c) Hoc enim vel maxime, Frater, & laboramus & laborare debemus ut unitatem à Domino & per APOSTOLOS NOBIS SUCCESSORIBUS traditam quantum possumus obtinere curamus, & quod in nobis est palabundas & errantes oves quas quorundam pervicax factio & hæretica temptatio à matre secerit, in ecclesiam colligamus, &c. Ep. 45. p. 88.

§ V.

(d) Vide paulo infra §

(e) Cyp. Bish. ex. § 39. p. 53.

(f) Observare dignabitur Christianus

Lector 1. Verba Dominica

ad LXX. discipulos nominationem pertinuisse

2. Cyprianum qui eos Apostolorum titulo dignatur

XII. οὐτως

QUANTUM LICUIT exequavisse, &c.

Blond. Apol. pro Sent. Hieron. p. 43. Quid si bi voluit per hæc verba

Quantum licuit? Cyprianumne, modo LICUISSET,

LXX. XII. omnino EXÆQUATOS voluisse, verum quia non LICUIT, non usquequaque EXÆQUAVISSE? Unde liquebat Blondello, adeo Cypriano fuisse in verbis LXX. XII. EXÆQUAVISSE modo LICUISSET unde LICUIT Blondello quod adeo non LICUIT Cypriano? Blondello vero hanc exæquationem LICUISSE videre est, p. 109. sed hæc obiter.

LXX. XII. omnino EXÆQUATOS voluisse, verum quia non LICUIT, non usquequaque EXÆQUAVISSE? Unde liquebat Blondello, adeo Cypriano fuisse in verbis LXX. XII. EXÆQUAVISSE modo LICUISSET unde LICUIT Blondello quod adeo non LICUIT Cypriano? Blondello vero hanc exæquationem LICUISSE videre est, p. 109. sed hæc obiter.

LXX. XII. omnino EXÆQUATOS voluisse, verum quia non LICUIT, non usquequaque EXÆQUAVISSE? Unde liquebat Blondello, adeo Cypriano fuisse in verbis LXX. XII. EXÆQUAVISSE modo LICUISSET unde LICUIT Blondello quod adeo non LICUIT Cypriano? Blondello vero hanc exæquationem LICUISSE videre est, p. 109. sed hæc obiter.

LXX. XII. omnino EXÆQUATOS voluisse, verum quia non LICUIT, non usquequaque EXÆQUAVISSE? Unde liquebat Blondello, adeo Cypriano fuisse in verbis LXX. XII. EXÆQUAVISSE modo LICUISSET unde LICUIT Blondello quod adeo non LICUIT Cypriano? Blondello vero hanc exæquationem LICUISSE videre est, p. 109. sed hæc obiter.

LXX. XII. omnino EXÆQUATOS voluisse, verum quia non LICUIT, non usquequaque EXÆQUAVISSE? Unde liquebat Blondello, adeo Cypriano fuisse in verbis LXX. XII. EXÆQUAVISSE modo LICUISSET unde LICUIT Blondello quod adeo non LICUIT Cypriano? Blondello vero hanc exæquationem LICUISSE videre est, p. 109. sed hæc obiter.

LXX. XII. omnino EXÆQUATOS voluisse, verum quia non LICUIT, non usquequaque EXÆQUAVISSE? Unde liquebat Blondello, adeo Cypriano fuisse in verbis LXX. XII. EXÆQUAVISSE modo LICUISSET unde LICUIT Blondello quod adeo non LICUIT Cypriano? Blondello vero hanc exæquationem LICUISSE videre est, p. 109. sed hæc obiter.

LXX. XII. omnino EXÆQUATOS voluisse, verum quia non LICUIT, non usquequaque EXÆQUAVISSE? Unde liquebat Blondello, adeo Cypriano fuisse in verbis LXX. XII. EXÆQUAVISSE modo LICUISSET unde LICUIT Blondello quod adeo non LICUIT Cypriano? Blondello vero hanc exæquationem LICUISSE videre est, p. 109. sed hæc obiter.

LXX. XII. omnino EXÆQUATOS voluisse, verum quia non LICUIT, non usquequaque EXÆQUAVISSE? Unde liquebat Blondello, adeo Cypriano fuisse in verbis LXX. XII. EXÆQUAVISSE modo LICUISSET unde LICUIT Blondello quod adeo non LICUIT Cypriano? Blondello vero hanc exæquationem LICUISSE videre est, p. 109. sed hæc obiter.

LXX. XII. omnino EXÆQUATOS voluisse, verum quia non LICUIT, non usquequaque EXÆQUAVISSE? Unde liquebat Blondello, adeo Cypriano fuisse in verbis LXX. XII. EXÆQUAVISSE modo LICUISSET unde LICUIT Blondello quod adeo non LICUIT Cypriano? Blondello vero hanc exæquationem LICUISSE videre est, p. 109. sed hæc obiter.

EVERY whit as plain is that other Testimony we have in Ep. 66. where our Martyr thus chastises *Florentius Pupianus*, who had questioned his Title to his Bishoprick. *Neither do I say these things* (some things he had said in his own Defence, of which hereafter) *by way of boasting, but with an afflicted Heart, seeing thou constitutest thy self a Judge of God and of Christ, who says to his Apostles, and THEREBY TO ALL BISHOPS who SUCCEED to the APOSTLES by a VICARIOUS ORDINATION, He that beareth you, beareth me; and he that beareth me, beareth him that sent me, &c.* (d). One would think it were scarcely possible to assert this Prerogative more plainly, or word it more distinctly: Yet *Blondel* found a Scruple to throw in here, and G. R. after him has mention'd it: It is, that S. *Cyprian* here, plainly calleth the Successors of the LXX Disciples, as well as those of the Apostles, *PRÆPOSITOS*. Why so? *Because of them that place* Luc. 10. 16. *which he citeth is to be understood* (e). And true it is, indeed, that Saying was directed by our Lord to the LXX; nor do we find it any where in any of the Four Gospels, *in terminis* directed to the XII. But what Advantage can G. R. make of such an Observation? Is it that S. *Cyprian* calls *Presbyters* who by many are said to have succeeded to the LXX *PRÆPOSITOS*, as well as the Bishops, who succeed to the XII? Will he allow of such an Imparity between Bishops and Presbyters, as there must needs be, if Bishops succeed to the XII, and Presbyters only to the LXX? Or, did G. R. intend that which seems to have been intended (tho' pretty obscurely worded (f) by his Master *Blondel*, viz. That S. *Cyprian* by

LXX. XII. omnino EXÆQUATOS voluisse, verum quia non LICUIT, non usquequaque EXÆQUAVISSE? Unde liquebat Blondello, adeo Cypriano fuisse in verbis LXX. XII. EXÆQUAVISSE modo LICUISSET unde LICUIT Blondello quod adeo non LICUIT Cypriano? Blondello vero hanc exæquationem LICUISSE videre est, p. 109. sed hæc obiter.

by applying to the XII, that which was said by our Lord to the LXX, did insinuate an *Equality* between the XII and the LXX, and by consequence a *Parity* among their *Successors*? But how can this prove a solid Advantage to him, so long as it is impossible for him to make it appear so much as probable, that S. Cyprian believed the LXX. as making a *distinct College* from that of the XII. to have *had* any *standing Office* in the *Christian Church*, in which they were to have a *constant Line* of *Successors*? No Intimation, no not the slenderest Insinuation of such a Belief in any of his Writings. On the contrary, it is to be presumed, that one of his Abilities and Diligence in searching the Evangelical Records, could hardly have missed to observe that which is so obviously observable in them; I mean, that the Christian Church was not, could not be founded till our Lord was risen, seeing it was to be founded on his Resurrection. Our Martyr (as appears from his Reasonings on divers Occasions) seems very well to have known, and very distinctly to have observed, that the Apostles themselves got not their Commission to be Governours of the Christian Church, till after the Resurrection. And no wonder, for this their Commission is most observably recorded, *Joh. 20, 21, 22, 23.* no such thing any where recorded concerning the LXX. Nothing more certain, than That Commission which is recorded *Luc. 10.* did constitute them only *Temporary Missioners*, and that for an *Errand* which could not possibly be more than *Temporary*. That Commission contains in its own Bosom clear Evidences, that it did not install them in any standing Office at all, much less in any standing Office in the Christian Church, which was not yet in being, when they got it. Could that Commission which is recorded, *Luke 10.* any more constitute the LXX *standing Officers* of the Christian Church, than the like Commission, recorded *Mat. 10.* could constitute the XII such *standing Officers*? But 'tis manifest, that the Commission recorded *Mat. 10.* did not constitute the XII, Governours of the *Christian Church*; otherwise, what need of a *new Commission* to that purpose, after the Resurrection? Presumeable therefore it is, that S. Cyprian did not at all believe that the LXX had any *Successors*, Office-Bearers in the Christian Church, seeing it is so observable, that they themselves receiv'd no Commission to be such Office-Bearers. But if this be so, what is become of the Advantage G. R. thought to have made of his aforesaid Observation?

BUT you may say, How then came S. Cyprian to accommodate to the XII, that which our Lord said only to the LXX?

§ VI.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

How could he make this Saying an Argument for due Regards to be paid to Christian *Bishops*, as being *Successors* to the *Apostles*, when it was not said to the *Apostles*, but to the *LXX Disciples*, who by the former Reasoning, could have no *Successors* Governours of the Christian Church? What if I should answer, That I cannot tell what might move him to make such an Accommodation? Would it thence follow, that G. R.'s groundless Phansie must take place, even after it is so fairly proved, not only to be groundless, but repugnant to the Truth of the Evangelical History? What if I should say that it is highly possible that S. *Cyprian* (especially if we suppose him to have written this 66th. *Epist.* in haste) might have been capable of such a harmless Mistake as this, of citing what was said to the *LXX*, as if it had been said to the *XII*? What danger can there be in such a Plea? Certainly such an Oversight, being at most but an Escape of Memory, can never weaken his Authority in any matter of consequence; especially seeing it doth in no wise appear that he was ordinarily liable even to such harmless Mistakes: Why might not S. *Cyprian* have been capable of such an innocent Escape, without any Diminution of his Credit, as well as G. R. has been in the very citation of this Epistle, in the very same period in which he cites it, in order to make his Observation, which I have just now considered? He says it was directed to *Jubaianus*, whereas it was, indeed, to *Florentius Pupianus*. Was it not as excusable in *Cyprian* to have fallen into his Mistake (if he fell into it) when it may be supposed that he wrote his Epistle in an hurry, as it was for G. R. to fall into his, when it is certain he wrote his Book in order to a Publication, and by consequence was bound to write it with the greatest Accuracy? And yet, had G. R. been guilty of no greater Mistakes in his Book, he should have passed with me for an excellent Author. But as I need not, so I do not lay any stress on this Answer.

§ VI.

I have another at hand which seems to me to be both solid and satisfactory: It is, that the *intrinsic Accommodableness* of the Saying to the *XII*, as well as to the *LXX*, might justly have moved S. *Cyprian* to *accommodate* it to them. Tho' it was originally spoken to the *LXX*, yet such a Saying it was, as was equally proper to have been said not only to the *XII*, but to any to whom our Lord, at any time, gave any Commission, any manner of way, to declare or proclaim any Gospel-Truth. It was indeed a Saying *virtually* contained in every Commission, granted by

by him; and by consequence most *eminently* contained in the *most eminent Commissions*, such as those were which were granted to the XII Apostles. It was a Saying pronounced by our Lord, by way of encouragement, to the LXX; and S. Cyprian did not doubt (as he had no reason) that the *Apostles* had an *Interest* in it proportionable to the *Importance* of their *Commission*; and by consequence, even a *greater Interest* than that of the LXX themselves, to whom it was originally directed. And now,

§ VII.

IF this be a just and solid account of the matter (as I will still hold it to be, till G. R. shall solidly prove that it is not) there can remain no difficulty about this Testimony of S. Cyprian's. Nothing can hinder it from being a plain and positive Evidence, that *Bishops* are *Successors* to the *Apostles* in the *Supreme Power Ecclesiastical*. This is certain, S. Cyprian, by *PRÆPOSITOS*, meant *Bishops*, and *Bishops only*; *Bishops*, as making a *distinct Order* from *Presbyters*. Nothing more certain than this, from the whole train of his Discourse and Reasoning. *Pupianus* had so far questioned his Integrity, as that he pretended he had forfeited his Title to his Bishoprick; and he had separated from his Communion. Now consider how our Martyr reasons the Case with him; he tells him, that *before the Persecution, he himself (Pupianus) had own'd him as a Bishop, and communicated with him*. And what had he done in the time of the Persecution to *unbishop him*? Had he *lapsed*? Had he made the *least sinful Compliance* to avoid the *Dint* of it? Had he not been *banished*, and his *Estate confiscated*, because he would not at all *comply*? Nay, had he not suffered for this very Cause that he was a *Bishop*? Had not the Sentence pronounced against him most manifestly born, that it was as *he was a Bishop* that it was pronounced against him? This was so notorious, that if *Pupianus* would not believe God, who had made him a *Bishop*, yet he might be convinced that he was one, and one with a good Title, by this Argument, that, *As he was one, the Devil had persecuted him with the Sentence of Proscription*. Now take his very words, as near as I can translate 'em, *Neither do I say these things boasting (says he) but with an afflicted Heart, seeing thou constitutest thy self a Judge of God and of Christ, who says to his Apostles, and THEREBY to all PRÆPOSITI, Bishops, who SUCCEED TO THE APOSTLES BY A VICARIOUS ORDINATION, He that heareth you, heareth me, &c. For hence have Schisms and Heresies hitherto sprung, and do daily spring, That the BISHOP, who is ONE, and is SET OVER the Church, is condemned by the proud Presumption of some, and THE MAN*

(g) Nisi si
SACERDOS
(i. e. pro stylo
Cyprianico E-
piscopus) tibi
fui ante perse-
cutionem
quando me-
cum commu-
nicabas; post
persecutionem
SACERDOS
esse desivi.
Persecutio e-
nim veniens te
ad summam
Martyrii subli-
mitatem pro-
vexit, me au-
tem proscrip-
tionis onere
depressit, cum
publice legeretur,
SI QUIS
TENET vel
POSSIDET
DE BONIS
CÆCILII CY-
PRIANI EPI-
SCOPI CHRIS-
TIANO-
RUM; ut et-
iam qui non
credebant Deo
EPISCOPUM
constituenti,
vel Diabolo

MAN whom God has honoured is reputed unworthy by Men. For what swelling of Pride, what Arrogance of Spirit, what Haughtiness of Mind is this, that thou shouldest arraign [Præpositos & Sacerdotes, i. e. in one word] Bishops before thy Tribunal! And if we are not purged by thee, and absolved by thy Sentence, Lo! Now these Six Years, the Brotherhood has had no BISHOP, the People no RULER, the Flock no PASTOR, the Church no GOVERNOUR, Christ no PRELATE, and God no PRIEST. You have our Martyr's own Words on the Margent (g). Let any Man of common Sense and common Ingenuity consider them, and let him say, if he can, that S. Cyprian, by PRÆPOSITOS, meant any other than BISHOPS; that it was not BISHOPS, and Bishops alone, whom he affirms to have SUCCEEDED to the APOSTLES by a VICARIOUS ORDINATION. Is not all this reasoning for his own Vindication? Is it not manifest therefore, that he meant by PRÆPOSITI, such as he was himself? Such as when they were proscribed, were proscribed as Bishops. Is it not manifest, that he meant such PRÆPOSITI as were the Principles of Unity to their respective Churches? Such as of whom there could be but ONE at once in a Church, whatever might be the Number of inferior PRÆPOSITI? What can be plainer, than that by all these Names of Ruler, Governour, Pastor, Prelate, Priest, &c. he meant only the ONE BISHOP? Could any ONE Presbyter, particularly in the Church of Carthage, in which were many Presbyters, be that ONE PERSON who was OVER the Church? That ONE MAN, whom God had peculiarly honoured? That ONE MAN, who could not be judged by Men? That ONE MAN, whom the whole Fraternity, that is, all the Christians in Carthage, had for their BISHOP? All the People

crederent EPISCOPUM proscribenti. Nec hæc jacto sed dolens profero cum te judicem Dei constituas & Christi qui dicit ad APOSTOLOS ac PER HOS ad OMNES PRÆPOSITOS (Non quosvis vel cujusvis ordinis, sed) QUI APOSTOLIS VICARIA ORDINATIONE SUCCEDUNT, (qui Apostolorum vices tenent in summa potestatis Ecclesiastica administratione), Qui audit vos, me audit, & qui me audit, audit eum qui me misit: Et qui rejicit vos, me rejicit, & qui me rejicit, rejicit eum qui me misit. Inde enim schismata & hæreses obortæ sunt & oriuntur, dum EPISCOPUS QUI UNUS EST, & ECCLESIAE PRÆEST; superba quorundam præsumptione contemnitur & HOMO DIGNATIONE DEI HONORATUS (ad episcopatus apicem propectus) indignus ab hominibus judicatur. Quis enim hic est superbiæ tumor, quæ arrogantia animi, quæ mentis inflatio, ad cognitionem suam PRÆPOSITOS & SACERDOTES vocare, ac nisi apud te purgati fuerimus, & sententia tua absoluti, ecce jam sex annis, nec fraternitas habuerit EPISCOPUM, nec plebs PRÆPOSITUM, nec grex PASTOREM, nec Ecclesia GUBERNATOREM, nec Christus ANTISTITEM, nec Deus SACERDOTEM? Epist. 66. p. 166, 167.

People for their Ruler? The whole Flock for its PASTOR? The whole Church for her GOVERNOUR, and Christ for his PRELATE, and God for his PRIEST? I cannot think but there is here such Brightness of Evidence as will convince even G. R. himself, when he shall seriously consider it.

MUCH more to this purpose might easily be collected from the Writings of our Martyr: For instance, What can be more irresistible than his Reasonings on divers occasions, founded on the supposition of this Prerogative? Particularly, in Ep. 33. and Ep 73. and in his excellent Discourse of the Unity of the Church? But I forbear to insist on them here, because I may have opportunity to do it more fully hereafter (b).

§ VIII.

NEITHER was it peculiar to our Martyr thus to assert this Episcopal Prerogative. Firmilian is every whit as positive; he says expressly, that the Power of Remitting Sins was given to the Apostles, and to the Churches which they founded, and to the BISHOPS WHO SUCCEED TO THE APOSTLES BY A VICARIOUS ORDINATION (i). He says indeed oftner than once, that he does exactly agree with S. Cyprian in all his Sentiments: And here we have a remarkable Instance of it: We having him professing S. Cyprian's Principle in S. Cyprian's very Language, using the very Phrase of a VICARIOUS ORDINATION, which most emphatically imports, that Bishops succeeded to the Apostles in the Supremacy of the Power Ecclesiastical. Pontius likewise (our Martyr's Deacon, his Companion in his Exile, and his Biographer) fairly gives us his Testimony to the same purpose, when he tells, that S. Cyprian was the First Bishop in Africa, who, AFTER THE APOSTLES, was honoured with the Crown of Martyrdom: For since ever the ORDER OF EPISCOPACY WAS NUMBRED at Carthage (so he words it; but his Sense is plainly neither more nor less than if he had said, since the Succession of Bishops, which began in the Apostles, can be derived down at Carthage) never any of the Bishops, tho' they were very good Men, is recorded to have suffer'd (k).

(b) CAP. X.
§ II, III, &c.

§ IX.

(i) Potestas ergo remittendorum peccatorum APOSTOLIS data est & Ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt & EPISCOPIS QUI EIS (Apostolis) ORDINATIONE VICARIA SUCCESSERUNT.

Ep. 75. p. 225.

(k) Sic consummata passionis perfectionem est ut

And

Cyprianus qui bonorum omnium fuerat exemplum etiam SACERDOTALES (i.e. Episcopales) coronas in Africa primus imbueret, quia & talis esse POST APOSTOLOS prior coeperat. Ex quo enim Carthaginensi EPISCOPATUS ORDO NUMERATUR, nunquam aliquis quamvis ex bonis & sacerdotibus, ad passionem venisse memoratur. Pontius in vita Cypri. p. 10. Pontio Afro idem esse EPISCOPATUS ORDINEM NUMERARE quod Tertulliano itidem Afro prius fuerat ORDINEM EPISCOPORUM EVOLVERE (Vide Tertul. Præscrip. adv. Her. cap. 32.) atque exinde eundem utriusque esse sensum, quis sensus dubitaverit?

(1) Manifesta
est sententia
Domini nostri
Jesu Christi
APOSTO-
LOS SUOS
mittentis, &
IPSIS SOLIS
potestatem à
patre sibi da-
tam permitten-
tis, QUIBUS
NOS SUC-
CESSIMUS,
EADEM PO-

TESTATE ecclesiam Dei GUBERNANTES, &c. Suff. 79. Per pronomem vero NOS, solos denotari episcopos, episcopos, inquam, à presbyteris ordine diversos, infra manifestissimum fiet, nempe § XVIII. & LXIX, &c.

And Confessor Clarus à Muscula, tho' he had been concerned in our present Controversies, tho' he had been engaged in a Scuffle with G. R. could not have more nicely and distinctly worded the matter, than he has done in his *Suffrage*, in the venerable Council of Carthage, convoked Anno 256. for determining the Controversie concerning heretical and schismatical Baptisms. For there he affirms, that Christ sent his APOSTLES, and to them ALONE committed the Power given him by his Father: To which APOSTLES (says he) WE (Bishops) have SUCCEEDED, GOVERNING the Church of our Lord by the SAME POWER, &c. But of this Testimony more hereafter (1).

§ X.

THE mentioning of the Controversie concerning heretical and schismatical Baptisms, has given me occasion to remember another Argument for making it appear that it was the common belief of those Times, that BISHOPS, as making an Order different from that of Presbyters, were the *Apostles Successors*. It is that the main Argument (sure I am S. Austin did so reckon of it) (m) insisted on by Stephen, Bishop of Rome; for the Validity of such Baptisms was, that it had been handed down to him by an unquestionable Tradition, that S. Peter and S. Paul, who founded the Church of Rome, and to whom he succeeded as Bishop of that See, had sustained the Validity of such Baptisms. That this was his Argument, and that his Succession to those Apostles, as Founders of the Church of Rome, was involv'd in his Reasoning, seems to me to be demonstratively colligible from Firmilian's account of the Argument, and his Answers to it. His account of the Argument is expressly this, That Stephen said that the Apostles forbade to baptize those who came from Heresie, and deliver'd this to be observed by their SUCCESSORS (n). And nothing can be clearer than it is, from his Answers to this Argument, that the Apostles mention'd in it, were no other than S. Peter and S. Paul, to whom Stephen succeeded in the Episcopal Chair of Rome.

(m) That
S. Austin re-
cognized this to
be Stephen's
best Argument,
will appear to
any who will
take the pains
to consult him,
Lib. 2. Contra
Donatistas de
Baptismo,
cap. 7. 9.
Lib. 3. c. 4, 5,
6, 7, 8, 9.
Lib. 4. c. 6.
Lib. 5. c. 23.
De unico bap-
tismo contra
Petil. c. 9, 11.
contra Cresco-
nium Gram-
maticum,
Lib. 2. c. 33.
(n) Et qui-
dem quantum

ad id pertineat prohibuerint quod Stephanus dixit, quasi Apostoli eos qui ab hæresi veniant baptizari prohibuerint & hoc custodiendum POSTERIS tradiderint, &c. Epist. 75. p. 219.

IT

IT might be clear to the satisfaction of every Reasonable Man, tho' we had no more than the First thing which *Firmilian* returns to the Argument; which is, That *Stephen's* Allegation was utterly False: "He could have no such *Tradition* from those Apostles, from whom he pretended to have it, and that for this very good Reason, That in their Days there were no Heretical Communions; by consequence no Heretical Baptisms, no Baptisms out of the true Communion of the Church Catholick. It was not only certain that *Marnon* and *Apelles* lived late after the Apostles, and at a long distance of Time after them, but even the Time of *Valentinus* and *Basilides* was manifest; and nothing more certain, than that it was a Long Age after the Apostles, before they began to Rebel against the Church of God, or to Separate from it. Nay, it was certain, that all the other Hereticks introduced their wicked Sects and perverse Inventions [POSTEA] after the Apostles

had departed this Life. (o) Now, this Account of *Firmilian's* is abundantly True, if by Apostles you mean only *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, who, according to the Calculations of the most Accurate Chronologists, died Anno 64. But it is unquestionably False, and *Firmilian* himself could not but very well know it to be so, if it was to be understood of the Apostles indefinitely. He could not but know that there were many Hereticks, such as the *Nicolaitans*, the *Ebionites*, the *Cerinthians*, &c. Contemporary with the Apostle *St. John*. No Ecclesiastical Writer more Celebrated, in the Days of *Firmilian*, than *Irenæus*, that most Curious Searcher or Sister of all Doctrines, as *Tertullian* calls him. (p) And he wrote in Greek, the Language of the Country where *Firmilian* was a Bishop. No doubt therefore, but such a Great Man as *Firmilian*, (one of the most Eminent Bishops of his Age) was well acquainted with *Irenæus's* Books, particularly his Five against Heresies. But how is it imaginable, that he could have read those Books without observing that divers Hereticks were Contemporary with *St. John*, without observing that most Observable Account (and as credibly Attested

(o) Neminem tam Stultum esse qui hoc credat Apostolos tradidisse, quando etiam ipsa Hæreses constet execrabiles & Detestandas POSTEA extitisse, cum & Marcion Cerdonis Discipulus inveniatur SERO POST APOSTOLOS & POST LONGA ab eis TEMPORA Sacrilegam adversas Deum traditionem induxisse. Apelles quoque blasphemæ ejus Consentiens multa alia Nova & graviora fidei ac veritati inimica addiderit. Sed & Valentini & Basilidis tempus Manifestum est quod & ipsi post Apostolos & POST LONGAM ÆTATEM adversus Dei Ecclesiam Sceleratis Mendaciis suis Rebellerint. Ceteros quoque Hæreticos constat pravas suas Sectas & inventiones perverfas—— POSTEA induxisse,

miæ ejus Consentiens multa alia Nova & graviora fidei ac veritati inimica addiderit. Sed & Valentini & Basilidis tempus Manifestum est quod & ipsi post Apostolos & POST LONGAM ÆTATEM adversus Dei Ecclesiam Sceleratis Mendaciis suis Rebellerint. Ceteros quoque Hæreticos constat pravas suas Sectas & inventiones perverfas—— POSTEA induxisse, p. 219, 220. (p) Adv. Valent. cap. 5.

as Observable) of St. *John's* running out of the *Bath* when he saw that *First-rate Enemy of the Truth, Cerinthus* in it?

(q) Lib. 3. c. 3.

(q) Nay, suppose (if such an Incredible supposition may be made) that *Firmilian* had never seen the Books of *Irenaeus*, yet it cannot be supposed that he had not seen (that which, no doubt, was a part of his *Canon* of the Scriptures) St. *John's* First Epistle: And even, from that, He could not but have Learn'd that, in St. *John's* Time, divers Hereticks had Separated from the Church. (r) Besides, 'Tis scarcely credible, that He, who affirms so positively that the *Time* of *Valentinus* and *Basilides* was Manifest, would have said that it was a Long Age after the Death of St. *John* (perhaps some other Apostles might be brought into the Account) before they Rebelled against the Church of God. But very justly, because very truly He might have said it, with Regard to St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*. It is not to be doubted, then, that St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* were the *Apostles* meant by *Stephen*, and understood by *Firmilian*. But why these Two singled out, and particularly insisted on by *Stephen*, as *Approvers* and *Ratifiers* of *Heretical Baptisms*? And why this so confidently pretended by him to have been handed down to him by unquestionable Tradition? Why all this, I say, but because He was their *Successor* in the *Episcopal Chair* of *Rome*? How G. R. may judge of this Reasoning I know not, but to me it seems solid and concludent: And yet the Good Luck is, it is not all I have to rely on. For, indeed,

(r) 1 Joh. 2.
19.

FIRMILIAN in plain Terms tells us, that St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* were the *Apostles* meant by *Stephen*: And that he slandered them by Fathering such a Tradition on them, seeing it was certain that they Taught the quite contrary in their

(s) — adhuc
etiam infamans
Petrum & Paulum
beatos Apostolos
quasi hoc ipsi
tradiderint: qui
in Epistolis suis
Haereticos ex-
crati sunt, &c.
p. 220.

Epistles. (s) Neither does *Firmilian* once offer to call *Stephen's* Succession to them in Question. He is Earnest indeed to represent *Stephen* as Maintaining a Plea very much unbecoming such a *Succession*. So much, indeed, I take to be aim'd at, as to St. *Paul*, in that Reasoning of his, which we have p. 221. which runs to this purpose: "That St. *Paul* (Acts 19.) Re-baptized those who had been Baptized by *John the Baptist*: Ought not we then (says he) to Baptize those who come from Heresy to the Church? Will any Man say that the Bishops now-a-days are greater than St. *Paul* was? which they must needs be, if they are able to do that which he could not; if they by Imposition of

"Hands

“ Hands only, can give the Holy Ghost to Hereticks when
 “ they come to them. (t) But the Case is clearer as to
 St. Peter : *Firmilian* tells us twice over, that *Stephen* pre-
 tended to be his *Successor* : He Chastises his Pride indeed,
 for being too much puffed up with the Honour of such a
Succession. He Labours to prove him unworthy of such a
Succession : He Treats him with such a Freedom, as may con-
 vince any Man, of Common Sense, that He did not believe
 the *Bishop* of *Rome* to be *Head* of the *Church Catholick* ; and
 far less, his *Infallibility*. All these things are evident from
 his Language, which you have on the Margent (u). But
 He is so far from making the least Objection against his be-
 ing St. Peter's Successor, that He does not insinuate the least
 doubt about it. Indeed, to have Objected against it, in those
 Days, had been to have exposed himself to the common
 Laughter of all Christians ; nothing being then more univer-
 sally received, than that the *Bishops* of *Rome* were St. Peter's
Successors. It had been certainly most choaking to St. Cy-
 prian, to whom his Epistle was written, who has many times
 Asserted that the *Bishops* of *Rome* sat in the *Chair* of St. Pe-
 ter. And why should he have made Objections against it ?
 He, I say, who (as we have already seen) so firmly believed
 and plainly affirmed, that *All Bishops were Successors to the*
Apostles ?

(t) Quale est
 autem ut cum
 Paulum post
 Joannis bap-
 tisma iteratò
 discipulos suos
 baptizasse vi-
 deamus, nos
 eos qui ab Hæ-
 resi ad Eccle-
 siam veniunt
 post infirmitatem
 & profanam eo-
 rum tinctio-
 nem baptizare
 dubitemus ?
 Nisi si HIS
 EPISCOPIS
 DE QUIBUS
 NUNC, minor
 fuit Paulus, ut
 hi quidem
 possint per so-
 lam manus im-
 positionem
 venientibus
 Hæreticis dare
 Spiritum San-
 ctum, Paulus
 autem idoneus

non fuerit — p. 221. (u) Atq; Ego in hac parte justè indignor ad hanc tam apertam &
 Manifestam Stephani Stultitiam, quod qui sic de EPISCOPATUS SUI LOCO GLORIA-
 TUR & se SUCCESSIONEM PETRI TENERE contendit, super quem fundamenta Ec-
 clesiæ Collocata sunt, multas alias PETRAS inducat, & Ecclesiarum multarum nova ædificia
 Constituat, dum esse ILLIC (in Conventiculis Hæreticorum) baptisma sua auctoritate defendit.
 Nam qui Baptizantur complent sine dubio Ecclesiæ Numerum. Qui autem baptisma eorum
 probat, de Baptizatis & Ecclesiam illic esse Confirmat. Nec intelligit obfuscare à se & quo-
 dammodo aboleri Christianæ Petræ veritatem, qui sic prodit & deferit Unitatem. Judæos
 tamen quamvis ignorantia cæcos & gravissimo facinore Constrictos Zelum Dei Apostolus ha-
 bere profitetur : Stephanus qui PER SUCCESSIONEM PETRI CATHEDRAM HABERE
 SE PRÆDICAT, nullo adversus Hæreticos Zelo excitatur, &c. p. 225.

THE Sum is this : It was not only universally received, § XIII.
 as unquestionable Truth, in the *Cyprianic Age*, that *Bishops*,
 as Distinguished from *Presbyters*, were the *Successors* of the
Apostles, in the General ; but it was allowed for current,
 that particular Bishops could Instruct their particular Suc-
 cessions to particular Apostles, in particular Churches, in the
 Supreme Power Ecclesiastical. So, as we have seen, it was

allowed to *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*. No Man Questioned his Succession to *St. Peter*. *St. Cyprian* asserted it frequently. *Firmilian* did not Question it, when it was his Interest, when it might have been for the Advantage of his Cause to have Questioned it, if it had been Questionable. I say, *St. Peter*, for there I lay the stress of my present Cause, which I think fit to tell *G. R.* that He may not think he has done enough, if he shall raise dust against what I have said, to make it seem probable that *Stephen* did likewise look on *St. Paul* as one of his Predecessors. Many other things might have been farther adduced for clearing up this *Prerogative*. But what I have said may be sufficient, especially if we consider the next, which, if *G. R.* will not allow to be a Distinct *Prerogative*, yet, I think, He cannot well refuse it to be a forcible Confirmation of the *First*. It is.

§ XIV.

II. THAT by the Principles of that Age, none could be *rightfully* promoted to the Order of *Bishops*, but by SINGULAR SUCCESSION. According to the Multiplication of Christians in any City, and its adjacent Territory, there might have been a proportionable Multiplication of Presbyters. For example, there were 46 in the City of *Rome*: But whatever the Number of Christians was, however large the City was, however extended its Territory, there could be but ONE BISHOP. For this, in the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*, I produced a few Irresistible Testimonies. (u) Sure I am, the Answers return'd to them, by *G. R.* are of no imaginable weight, (v) none of them has so much as the colour of an Answer except one, and that one has no more, if it has so much. It is that *Dr. Hammond* (*Annot. on Apoc. 11. 3.*) says, *There were two Bishops at once in Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Rome, &c.* This, I say, has nothing of the substance of an Answer: For, besides that (tho' I do very much Honour him as a very Learned Man, and a very Excellent Person, yet) I do not think my self obliged to embrace every thing he has asserted. Besides this, I say, If *Dr. Hammond* has asserted no such thing concerning the *Cyprianic Age*, (and it is certain he has not) it is plain that his Authority is most surprizingly adduced, so long as it is only concerning that Age that *G. R.* and I have our present Controversy. All therefore I have now to do, is to add some other Arguments to prove, that in the *Cyprianic Age*, none could be duly promoted to the *Episcopal Order* but by *Singular Succession*. To which purpose, W E

(u) p. 11, 12.
(v) Cyp. B.
Exam. § 22.
P. 27.

WE have a most notable Testimony in St. Cyprian's notable Book *Of the Unity of the Church*, where, Discourfing of Schismatical Bifhops, Bifhops who made pretences in opposition to thofe who had been Canonically promoted, he Rejects and Condemns them upon this very fcore, that *they were not Raifed according to Divine Difpofition, but Conftituting themfelves Governours without Obferving the Neceffary Laws of Ordination, by affuming to themfelves the Names of Bifhops of Churches, where there was no Canonical vacancy.*

(x) So I underftand the Phrafe, [*Nemine Epifcopatum dante*] taking the true meaning of it to be, that no Man had made the See void for them to fucceed to it. I underftand it fo for two Reafons; one is, That 'tis certain that *Novatianus* (againft whom St. Cyprian feems mainly to have intended this Difcourfe) was *Ordained by Three Bifhops*, fo that the meaning of the Phrafe cannot be that *no Bifhops* had *Ordain'd* him. The other is, That the fenfe which I have given of the Phrafe is highly agreeable to the then received Principles, and particularly to the following Testimonies, which ferve to explain it, as well as further to confirm the *Prerogative* propofed to be proved. E. 6.

(x) Hi funt qui fe ultro apud temerarios Convenas (nempe tres illos Rusticos Epifcopos qui Ordinationi Novatiani inter fuerunt) fine Divina difpofitione preficiunt; qui fe PRÆPOSITOS fine ulla ORDINATIONIS

NATIONIS LEGE Conftituunt; qui NEMINE EPISCOPATUM DANTE Epifcopi fibi Nomen affumunt, &c. *De Unit. Eccl. p. 111.*

HOW often doth St. Cyprian Approve, and Praise and Juftify *Cornelius* his Promotion to the See of *Rome*, upon this very account, that he had been raifed Canonically, and according to the *Laws of Singular Succeffion*? Thus, he tells *Cornelius* himfelf, *Ep. 44.* that when *Novatianus's* Agents came to *Carthage*, and were very Earneft to have an Hearing, &c. He gave them this Answer once for all, That they ought to lay afide all Contention and Debate, and remember that it was Impiety to defer their Mother the Church; and that they ought to confider and acknowledge, that when once a Bifhop was promoted, and his Promotion approved by his Collegues, and the People, nothing could juftify the Promotion of another.

(y) And *Ep. 45.* He tells the fame *Cornelius*, that to fet up
 (y) — quibus
 femel respon-
 fum dedimus nec Mandare deftitimus ut perniciofa diffentione & Concertatione depofita, Impietatem effe fciant Matrem deferere & agnofcant & intelligant EPISCOPO SEMEL FACTO & Collegarum ac Plebis testimonio & iudicio Comprobato, ALIUM CONSTITUI NULLO MODO POSSE. *Ep. 44 p. 86.*

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

(2) Sed quoniam diversæ partis obstinata & inflexibilis pertinacia non tantum Radicis & Matris finem atq; complexum recufavit, sed etiam gliscit & in pejus Cruescente discordia
EPISCOPUM sibi Constituit & contra Sacramentum semel traditum divinæ dispositionis, & Catholicæ Unitatis
ADULTERUM & CONTRARIUM

an *Antibishop*, as the *Novatianists* had done, was to set up an **ADULTEROUS** and **CONTRARY HEAD**, OUT of the Church, in plain Contradiction to the Divine Ordinance, and the Fundamental Laws of Catholick Unity. (2) But as for *Cornelius*, He says that the RISE of his Ordination was necessary, and the Manner of it just; (a) that is, plainly, He had regularly succeeded to the Bishoprick of Rome, when that See was fairly vacant by the Death of *Fabianus*. And Ep. 55. He justifies the same *Cornelius* to *Antonianus*, as having been made Bishop when there was none made before him; when the PLACE of *Fabianus*, that is, the PLACE of Peter, and the DEGREE of the SACERDOTAL CHAIR, was vacant. (b) And Ep. 68. He tells *Stephen*, Bishop of Rome, how the African Bishops denied Communion to *Novatianus*, because by pretending to be Bishop of Rome, after *Cornelius* was Canonically promoted, he had turn'd himself out of the Church, Erected a Profane Altar, Constituted an Adulterous Chair, and attempted to offer Sacrilegious Sacrifices, in opposition to the True Priest, &c. (c) This is likewise St. *Cyprian's* chief Plea for himself, against the *Carthaginian Schismatics*, That he had Usurped no Mans Chair, he had not invaded any Man's Rights, his Predecessor was Dead before he was promoted; and he succeeded to the Chair when it was unquestionably vacant (d). Briefly,

CAPUT EXTRA ECCLESIAM fecit, &c. Ep. 45. p. 86.

(a) Sic enim nunc **EPISCOPATUS TUI** & Veritas pariter & Dignitas apertissima luce & Manifestissima, firmissima Comprobatione fundata est, ut ex Rescriptis Collegarum Nostorum qui ad Nos literas inde fecerunt, & ex Relatione ac Testimonio Coepiscoporum *Pompeii*, *Stephani*, *Caldonii* & *Fortunati* **ORDINATIONIS TUÆ** & **ORIGO NECESSARIA** & **RATIO JUSTA** & Gloriosa quoq; innocentia ab Omnibus Nosceretur, Ep. 48. p. 91.

(b) Factus est autem *Cornelius* Episcopus de Dei & Christi ejus Judicio, & de Clericorum pene omnium Testimonio—**CUM NEMO ANTE SE FACTUS** esset, cum *Fabiani LOCUS*, i. e. cum **LOCUS PETRI** & **GRADUS CATHEDRÆ SACERDOTALIS VACARET**.—Ep. 55. p. 104.

(c) Et cum ad Nos in *Africam* Legatos misisset (*Novatianus*) optans ad Communicationem Nostram admitti, hinc à Concilio plurimorum Sacerdotum qui præsentibus eramus Sententiam retulerit se foris esse capisse, nec posse à quoquam Nostrum sibi Communicari qui **EPISCOPO CORNELIO** in Catholica Ecclesia, de Dei judicio & Cleri ac Plebis Suffragio **ORDINATO**, **PROFANUM ALTARE ERIGERE** & **ADULTERAM CATHEDRAM COLLOCARE** & **SACRILEGA** contra **VERUM SACERDOTE** **SACRIFICIA** offerre tentaverit. Ep. 68. p. 177.

(d) Ceterum, dico enim provocatus, dico dolens, dico compulsus, quando **EPISCOPUS** in **LOCUM DEFUNCTI** substituitur, &c. Ep. 59. p. 130.

P R O M O

PROMOTION to a Bishoprick, by SINGULAR § XVII. SUCCESSION, was so very necessary, by the Cyprianic Principles, that it was as much received, that there could be but ONE BISHOP at once in a Church, as that there was but *One God*, and *One Christ*, and *One Holy Ghost*, and *One Catholick Church*. (e) It was so indispensibly necessary, that it passed for a Principle, that the Multiplication of Bishops unavoidably inferred the Multiplication of Churches. (f) That the Adhering to the *One True Bishop*, was Deem'd a *Real Confession* of the *Unity* of the *Church*. (g) That wherever a *Second Bishop* was set up, and a Party adhered to him, that Party was but a Church of Humane Invention, and had no Title to the Divine Promises. (h) Or, if you will have the same thing in other words, A *Second Bishop* was indeed *no Bishop* at all. (i) Nay, he was *no Christian*. (k) And those who own'd him, and adhered to his Communion, were *out of the Church*, which is the Spouse of Christ: And if they made a *Church* at all, it was but a *False One*; it was no part of the *True Catholick Church*; of that *Church* whereof *Christ* is the *Head*; of that *Church* which *Constitutes* his *Body*, and is *Quickened* by his *Spirit* (l) (m). Much more might have been collected to this purpose, but methinks what I have said may satisfy any Man, who has not resolved never to be satisfied.

(e) Ep. 43. p. 83. & Ep. 49. p. 93. See *Prin. Cyp. Age*, p. 12.

(f) Gravatum enim me atque contristat cum vos illic comperissem Maximum, Nicostrium, ceterosque Confessiones Romanos alloquitur qui Novatianum secuti, Ecclesiam Romanam sciderant contra Ecclesiasticam Dispositionem, contra Evangelicam legem, contra institutionis

Catholicæ unitatem, ALIUM EPISCOPUM Consensisse fieri, i. e. quod nec FAS est, nec LICET fieri, ECCLESIAM ALIAM CONSTITUI, Christi Membra discerpi, Dominici Gregis animum & Corpus Unum discissa amulatione lacerari. Ep. 46. p. 89.

(g) Nam & hæc fides & laudis vestræ alia CONFESSIO est UNAM ECCLESIAM CONFITERI; Nec alieni erroris vel potius pravitatis participem fieri, &c. verba Nostri sunt ad Maximum, Urbanum, &c. Novatianum deferentes & ad Ecclesiæ Matricem redeunt. Ep. 54. p. 99.

(h) Cum sit à Christo una Ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item Episcopatus unus Episcoporum multorum concordie Numerositate diffusus. Ille (Novatianus) post Dei Traditionem, post connexam & ubique conjunctam Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Unitatem HUMANAM CONETUR ECCLESIAM FACERE, &c. Ep. 55. p. 112.

(i) Quo (Fabiani LOCO à Cornelio) occupatò de Dei Voluntate atque omnium Nostri Consensione firmato, Quisquis jam Episcopus fieri voluerit FORIS fiat Necesse est; Nec habeat Ecclesiasticam Ordinationem qui Ecclesiæ non tenet Unitatem. Quisquis ille fuerit, multum de se licet jactans, & sibi plurimum vindicans, PROFANUS est, ALIENUS est, FORIS est: Et cum post PRIMUM SECUNDUS ESSE NON POSSIT, Quisquis post UNUM qui SOLUS esse debeat factus est, non jam SECUNDUS ille sed NULLUS est. Ep. 55. p. 104.

(k) Quisquis ille est & qualiscumque est CHRISTIANUS non est qui in Ecclesia Christi non est.

(l) Si occisi ejusmodi extra Ecclesiam fuerint, fidei Coronam non esse sed pœnam potius esse perfidiæ, &c. Ep. 60. p. 143.

(m) Intelligimus F. C. & tota Cordis nostri luce perspicimus divinæ Majestatis Salutaria & Sancta Consilia, unde illinc repentina Persecutio nuper exorta sit; unde contra Ecclesiam Christi & EPISCOPUM Cornelium Beatum Martyrem, vosq; omnes Secularis potestas subito proruperit, ut ad Confundendos Hæreticos & retundendos ostenderet Dominus quæ esset Ecclesia, Quis EPISCOPUS ejus UNUS divina Ordinatione plura delectus, &c. Ep. 61. p. 144, 145.

Vide plura, Ep. 69. p. 181. imo passim.

§ XVIII.

III. BY the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, Bishops, as succeeding to the Apostles, by such *Vicarious Ordination*, and *Singular Succession*, had this considerable *Prerogative*, that they made ONE COLLEGE by themselves; a College notoriously distinguished from the College of Presbyters. Both *Blondel* and *Salmasius* have ingenuously acknowledged this, as hath been already observed: (n) And no wonder, for (n) § XXIII, few things more frequently mentioned in the Cyprianic Monuments than the EPISCOPAL COLLEGE. Not any one Term more familiar to St. Cyprian, and his Contemporaries, than COLLEGA, Collegue: Yet however often used, never so much as once allowed by a Bishop to a Presbyter. Never so much as once a Presbyter called a Bishop's Collegue. Nothing surer than this; so that wherever you find St. Cyprian, after he was a Bishop, talking of his Collegues, you may as securely believe that those Collegues were Bishops, as you may believe any Article in your Creed. I could prove this by an Induction, if it were needful. I do hereby undertake to do it when G. R. or any Man, shall make it appear necessary to be done. But I think it is enough at present, that I dare challenge him, or any of his Party, to produce so much as one single Testimony, from any Author of that Age, in which a Presbyter is called a Bishop's Collegue; or said to be a Member of the Episcopal College.

§ XIX.

I DO readily grant indeed, that you'll find our Martyr calling Presbyters, Priests, Pastors, Rulers: He frequently calls them COM PRESBYTERI, i. e. Fellow-Presbyters. So he calls *Rogatianus* one of the Carthaginian Presbyters, (o) Ep. 7. p. 14. Ep. 7. (o) and *Primitivus*, Ep. 44. (p) and Ep. 48. (q) And *Quintus*, Ep. 55. (r) And *Lucianus*, Ep. 71. (s) Sometimes he bestows that Compellation on many Presbyters together, (q) Ep. 48. p. 90. as Ep. 14. (t) and Ep. 45. (u) and Ep. 71. (v) but he never calls a Presbyter either *Consacerdos* or *Collega*. These Titles, as well as *Coepiscopus*, he allows only to Bishops. (r) Ep. 14. p. 33 But what needs more? We find him frequently most manifestly, and, as it were, of set purpose, Distinguishing between

(p) Ep. 44. p. 86.

(q) Ep. 48. p. 90.

(r) Ep. 55. p. 101.

(s) Ep. 71. p. 193.

(t) Ep. 14. p. 33.

(u) Ep. 45. p. 87.

(v) Ep. 71. p. 193.

tween his *Colleagues* and *Presbyters*, as may appear sufficiently from the Testimonies on the Margent. (w) Now before we proceed any farther,

(w) Sed & si qui de Peregrinis EPISCOPI COL-

LEGÆ MEI, vel PRESBYTERI vel DIACONES præsentés fuerint, &c. Ep. 32. p. 65.

Accepi primas literas tuas — quibus significasti te cum Cornelio COEPISCOPO Nostro unum tenere Consensum; Scripsisti etiam ut exemplum earundem literarum ad Cornelium COLLEGAM nostrum transmitterem.—Sed enim supervenerunt aliæ literæ tuæ per Quintum COMPRESBYTERUM missæ, &c. Ep. 55. p. 101.

Quare in hunc scrupulum non inciderunt tot COEPISCOPI COLLEGÆ MEI, &c. Ep. 66. p. 167.

De qua re quid Nuper in Concilio plurimi COEPISCOPI cum COMPRESBYTERIS qui ad erant, Censuerimus—Nescio & enim qua præsumptione ducantur quidam de COLLEGIS nostris, &c. Ep. 71. p. 193.

Nos quantum in Nobis est propter Hæreticos cum COLLEGIS & COEPISCOPIS Nostri non Contendimus, &c. Ep. 73. p. 210.

LET but these Three things be laid together, 1. That by § XX. the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, *Bishops* were believed to be *Successors* to the *Apostles*, in the Ecclesiastical Sovereignty. 2. That they were raised to the *Episcopal Order* by *Singular Succession*. And, 3. That all *Bishops* so raised made one *College*, a *College* peculiar to themselves; a *College* whereof none were Members but *Bishops*: And let any Man of common Sense, and ordinary Skill, in such Matters, determine whether it be likely that *Bishops*, having such *Prerogatives*, had only MORE DIGNITY, but not MORE POWER, than *Presbyters*. Did the *Apostles* act in parity with single *Presbyters*? Had they only more Dignity, but not more Power? And to what purpose so much stress laid on *Singular Succession*? Why this so strictly, so nicely, so carefully provided for? Why made so absolutely necessary for the preservation of Unity? For avoiding the unwarrantable Multiplication of Churches? Why Promotion in Opposition to, or Disagreement with the Laws of it, Loaded with all the Black Characters of setting up *Altar* against *Altar*? Of setting up *False Priests* against *True Priests*? Of constituting *Adulterous Heads*, and *Adulterous Chairs*? *Sacrilegious Sacrifices* and *Detestable Communion*s? Why make it so manifest an Argument of *Schism*, or such a Deadly Thrust to *Schismatics*? Why, for this, exclude them from being Members of the *Catholic Church*? From being *Christians*? That is, from all *Hopes* of *Pardon*, from all *Interest* in the *Divine Promises*, from all *Expectations* of *Heaven*? Why, I say, all these sad and dreadful Characters and Consequences, if there was

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

no more in the Matter than an Invasion of *bare Dignity*? Than an Usurpation of *Simple Precedency*? Without any Eye to *Power*, to any thing of *Substantial Superiority*? I shall say no more, but that he who can entertain such Imaginations, must have very surprizing *Idea's* of the Primitive Times, and of the Wisdom of the Primitive Bishops.

§ XXI.

AND why combine them into *one College*? a *College* peculiar to themselves? A *College* in which *none* but *Bishops* could be *Colleagues*? Why this, I say, if all their Preheminence was no more than that of *bare Dignity*? than that they might have the *First Civilities*, or the *Chief Reverences* paid them? Who can Entertain such Speculations, who has bestowed so much as Three Thoughts about the Nature of a *College*, or the Notion of a *Colleague*, in the *Cyprianic*, or rather in the true *Roman Dialect*, from which *St. Cyprian* and his *Contemporaries* had those Terms? What is more notorious, than that those, and those only, could be *Colleagues*, who enjoy'd the same *Powers* and the same *Prerogatives*? Doth not *A. Gellius* tell us, from *Messala's* first Book, *De Auspiciis*, that tho' the *Roman Consuls*, and *Prætors*, and *Censors*, had the *Maxima Auspicia*, yet they were not all indifferently *Colleagues*, for this very reason, That they had not the *same Power*; making *parity* of *Power* thereby, the very Constituent of *Colleagues*? (x) Indeed, the very Original of the word imports so much: For whether you resolve it into [*con*] and [*lego*] or [*con*] and [*lex*] all comes to one purpose. If you Resolve it the first way, then *Colleagues* are those who have the same *Commission*: If the second way then those are *Colleagues* who are bound by the same *Laws*: Either way it manifestly imports *parity* of *Power*. And yet in every *College* (for there were very many among the *Romans*) *e. g.* in the *College* of *Augures*, there was an *Imparity* of *Dignity*: There was *Order*, a *First*, a *Second*, a *Third*, &c. among the *Colleagues*. And when they met to Order any Matter, *e. g.* to Interpret any *Auspicium* (which could only be done by the *College*, not by any *single Augur*) no Man doubts but there was one who presided in the Meeting, and perform'd the *Acts*, and had the *Dignities* of a *Moderator*. It were easy to insist largely on this Subject; but 'tis needless. All therefore I shall add at present, shall only be to Recommend to *G. R.* three of his own Friends, *Chamier*, *Salmasius* and *Blondel*, from whom he may receive further satisfaction

(x) Patriciorum Auspicia in duas sunt potestates divisæ Maxima sunt Consul, Prætor, Censor: Neque tamen eorum omnium inter se eadem; aut EJUSDEM POTESTATIS ideoq; COLLEGÆ non sunt. A. Gell. Noct. Attic. Lib. 13. cap. 14.

tisfaction concerning *Colleges* and *Collegues*. *Chamier* had so just a Notion of the true Nature of a *Collegue*, that he not only Formed the Bishop of Rome's being so frequently and ordinarily called their *Collegue* by other Bishops, into an Argument (and a solid one it is) against the Pope's Supremacy, but also he affirms, that after the Introduction of Episcopacy, *Presbyters* neither were, nor were called COLLEGUES to Bishops, upon this very score that they had not Equal Power with Bishops. And therefore he suspects the wording of the 35th Canon of the 4th Council of Carthage, which requires Bishops, in ordinary Conversation, to treat Presbyters as *Collegues*: He suspects the wording of it, I say, and thinks it reasonable to believe that the Fathers, who made the Canon, used some other Term; and that for this very reason, that to have made Presbyters *Collegues* to Bishops, had been to leave no Imparity of Power between them. (y) If I have Tripped in any thing of this Account, let it be imputed to the weakness of my Memory, for I have not the Book by me at present. But I shall ask no such allowances concerning *Salmasius* and *Blondel*, for you have their own words faithfully transcribed on the Margent. (z) The Force of all this Reasoning will still appear the greater, if we consider,

(y) *Panstrat.*
Tom. 2. Lib. 14.
Cap. 14. § 2. 9,
10, 12.

(z) *Alius Ordo*
est Presbyterorum,
alius
Episcoporum,

postquam ex uno duo facti sunt. Qui Sacramentem Ordinis nobis Condiderunt hujus etiam Opinionis fabri fuere quæ statuit non diversum esse Ordinem Presbyteri & Episcopi, quia non diversa nec alia Ordinatione Presbyteri creantur ac Episcopi; Nec alius imprimatur Character Sacerdotalis ex Ordinatione, quam Episcopis. Sed Ordo hoc sensu veteri Ecclesiæ & antiquis Patribus prorsum incognitus. Singula distincta CORPORA suum ORDINEM fecerunt. Non COLLEGÆ sunt Episcopi Presbyteris post introductam ORDINUM distinctionem. Ergo in diverso ORDINE sunt utriq; omnes; quippe UNIUS ORDINIS COLLEGÆ inter se sunt, & COLLEGIUM UNUM constituunt. In singulis etiam ORDINIBUS plures GRADUS sunt, Primus, Secundus, Tertius, qui etiam Ordinis Nomine plerumq; appellantur: Nam inde ORDO dictus est quod ORDINE GRADUS Locantur in unoquoq; COLLEGIO. *Wal. Messal. p. 464, 465.*

—Ex quo distincti Cleri Gradus (quam distinctionem ævo Cyprianico obtinuisse supra habuimus agnoscentem Blondellum) diversa Episcoporum & Presbyterorum COLLEGIA, &c. *Blond. Apol. pro Sent. Hieron. p. 162.*

IV. THAT in consequence of what hath been already § XXII.
insisted on, the Bishop of the Cyprianic Age had his peculiar
LOCUS and GRADUS, his Place and Degree, notoriously
different from the Place and Degree of Presbyters. Thus,
(to give only a Taste of this Prerogative) the Crime of the
Insolent Deacon, mentioned Ep. 3. was that being unmindful
of the LOCUS, the Place or Station, or Eminent Post of his
Bishop,

(a) Quod immemor SACERDOTALIS LOCI TUI—Ep. 3. p. 5.

(b) Atq; Utinam LOCI & GRADUS mei conditio permetteret ut IPSE nunc præsens esse possem. Ep. 12. p. 17.

(c) Sollicitudo LOCI NOSTRI & Timor Domini compellit—admonere vos, &c. Ep. 15. p. 33.

(d) Exponunt deinde invidiæ beatorum Martyres & Gloriosos Servos Dei cum Dei Sacerdotes committunt, ut cum illi Memores LOCI NOSTRI, &c. Ep. 16. p. 37.

(e) Peto discernatis desideria vestra &

quicunq; estis qui has literas nunc misistis, nomina vestra libello Subjiciatis & libellum cum Singulorum Nominibus ad me transmittatis. Ante enim est scire quibus rescribere habeam, tunc ad singula quæ Scripsistis pro LOCI & ACTUS nostri mediocritate rescribam. Ep. 33. p. 67.

(f) Religioni igitur Nostræ & Timori congruit & IPSI LOCO & OFFICIO SACERDOTII (i. e. Episcopatus) NOSTRI, in Dominico Calice miscendo & offerendo custodire traditionis Dominicæ veritatem. Ep. 63. p. 157.

(g) Quo in loco considerandum est F. C. pro fide & Religione SACERDOTALIS LOCI quo fungimur, an constare Sacerdotis Dei ratio in die judicii possit, asserentis & probantis—blasphemantium baptismata. Ep. 74. p. 214.

Bishop, he had not paid him due Regards, &c. (a) And how often doth our Martyr, while in his Retirement, tell those he wrote to, that his PLACE did not allow him to Return to his Charge according to his Inclinations? I wish (says he, Ep. 12.) that the condition of my PLACE and DEGREE would allow that I my self might be present with you to order Matters, &c. (b) And Ep. 15. The Solitude of my PLACE, and the Fear of God, compel me, &c. (c) And Ep. 16. He makes it a mighty Aggravation of the Crime of those Carthaginian Presbyters, who presum'd precipitantly to Absolve the Lapsers, that, against the Bishop, they stirred up the Martyrs, those Glorious Servants of God, who otherwise would have paid suitable Regards to his PLACE; (d) that is, would have lived in a Dutiful Subjection to him, as is evident from the Context. And Ep. 33. He tells the Lapsers, That he should give them such an Answer as might best become his PLACE and OFFICE, when they should give him more distinct Accounts of their Desires. (e) And Ep. 63. He tells Cacilius, that the Christian Religion, and the Fear of God, and the PLACE and PRIESTLY OFFICE of Bishops, obliged them to adhere closely to the Verity of Divine Tradition, in having Wine in the Cup in the Holy Eucharist. (f) And we have a remarkable Testimony to this purpose, Ep. 74. where he tells Pompeius, that Bishops, as they would be Faithful to their PLACE, ought to consider how they will be able to Answer for it at the day of Judgment, if they shall ratify Baptisms administered by Blasphemers, &c. (g) That is plainly, that by their PLACE, their POST, their Station, they had the Supreme Power of the Sacraments, as we shall afterward more fully learn. And as we have thus frequent mention made of the Place or Post of BISHOPS, so,

OUR Martyr divers times speaks of the *Locus*, the § XXIII. Place or Post of *Presbyters*, as quite different from the Place or Post of *Bishops*. What reason have we to be afraid of the wrath of God (says he, Ep. 16.) when some *Presbyters*, neither mindful of the Gospel, nor of THEIR OWN PLACE, nor thinking on the future Judgment of God, nor on the BISHOP their SUPERIOUR for the time, are bold to assume all to themselves, to the Contempt and Reproach of their Bishop; a thing never heretofore attempted under any of my Ancestors?

(h) G. R. I think, will have an hard pull of it to reduce this to bare Dignity. Again, tho' he promoted *Numidicus* to the Station of a *Presbyter* of Carthage, yet he promises, that so soon as God shall permit, he shall be promoted AD AMPLIOREM LOCUM, to an higher Station, (i) raised to a more Eminent Preferment: And what, I pray, could this be other than a Bishoprick? Was St. Cyprian at next Years, or half Years end, to resign his Moderatorial Chair to *Numidicus*? And when *Maximus* the Roman *Presbyter* deserted the Interests of *Navatianus*, and return'd to his Duty to *Cornelius*, *Cornelius* (as himself tells our Martyr, Ep. 49.) commanded him to resume his own PLACE; i. e. He restor'd him to the Exercise of the Office of a *Presbyter*. (k) Near of kin to this, is,

(h) Quid enim non periculum metuere debemus de Offensa Domini quando aliqui de Presbyteris nec Evangelii nec LOCI SUI Memores, sed neq; futurum Domini judicium, neque sibi nunc PRÆPOSITUM EPISCOPUM cogitantes, &c.

Ep. 16. p. 36. (i) Et promovebitur quidem cum Deus permiserit ad AMPLIOREM LOCUM Religionis suæ quando in præsentiam protegente Domino venerimus. Ep. 40. p. 79. (k) Quapropter Maximum Presbyterum LOCUM SUUM agnoscere jussimus. Ep. 49. p. 93.

V. THE Prerogative of the CHAIR, which, by the § XXIV. Principles of that Age, the Bishop had, as a Symbol of Power as much as of Dignity. He had his CATHEDRA, I say his CHAIR, his THRONE, as the Greeks call it: A Throne or Chair conspicuously elevated above the Seats of all the *Presbyters* who sat with him; and peculiarly Ornamented. So we learn from *Pontius's* Account of the Life of St. Cyprian, where he observes, that when St. Cyprian, just before his Martyrdom, was brought to the *Prætorium*, he was allowed, till the *Proconsul* came, to retire to an Apartment, where, by chance, there was a Seat covered with a Linen Cloth; Providence having so ordered it, that instantly before his Death he should have the Honour of a Bishop. (l) Now,

(l) Sedile autem erat fortuito linteo tectum, ut & sub ictu passionis EPISCOPATUS Honore frueretur. Pont. p. 9.

tuito linteo tectum, ut & sub ictu passionis EPISCOPATUS Honore frueretur. Pont. p. 9.

THIS,

§ XXV.

(m) Episcopi plurimi quos hortamento oportet esse & exemplo, divina procuratione contempta procuratores rerum secularium fieri derelicta CATHEDRA, &c. p. 123.
(n) Cum pro Episcopatus vigore & CATHEDRÆ Auctoritate haberes POSTESTATEM, &c. Ep. 3. p. 5.
(o) Audio tamen quosdam de Presbyteris—nec Episcopo Honorem SACERDOTII & CATHEDRÆ reservantes, &c. Ep. 17. p. 39.

THIS CHAIR, I say, is often mentioned as a *Symbol* of Power. Thus, in his Book about the *Lapsers*, our Martyr complains, that many Bishops, *contemning the Divine Procuration, and deserting their CHAIRS, and their People, turn'd Procurators of Secular Affairs.* (m) And Ep. 3. He says *Novatianus, without consulting any Man, might have punished his Insolent Deacon by the Authority of his CHAIR.* (n) And Ep. 17. He complains of some Presbyters, that *they did not reserve to himself their Bishop, the Honour of his CHAIR and Priesthood.* (o) That is, they presum'd to *evacuate his Sovereign Power* in the Discipline of the Church, by *Acting* in a Matter of such consequence, as the *Reconciling* of the *Lapsers* was, without him. Indeed, Ep. 43. He makes the CHAIR as much a *Symbol* of Power as the Bishops being *Head of the Church*, and her *Principle of Unity* can amount to. (p) And Ep. 52. He makes *Evaristus* his being deprived of his CHAIR, all one with his being *deprived* of his *Bishoprick.* (q) And Ep. 55. He justifies *Cornelius* his Promotion to the *Bishoprick* of Rome, upon this very score, that the *Degree* of the SACERDOTAL CHAIR was vacant when he was raised to it. (r) And a little after, he says that *Cornelius* fate Courageously at Rome, in his SACERDOTAL CHAIR, (he govern'd the Church as Bishop) *at a time when the Cruel Tyrant Decius was a declared Enemy to all Bishops,* &c. (s)

tii & CATHEDRÆ reservantes, &c. Ep. 17. p. 39.

(p) Deus Unus, & Christus Unus & una Ecclesia & CATHEDRA UNA Super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud Altare Constitui aut Sacerdotium Novum fieri præter Unum Altare & Unum Sacerdotium non potest. Ep. 43. p. 83.

(q) —Evaristum de Episcopo jam nec Laicum remansisse CATHEDRÆ & plebis extorrem, &c. Ep. 52. p. 96.

(r) —Cum Nemo ante se Factus esset, cum *Fabiani* Locus, i. e. cum Locus Petri & GRADUS CATHEDRÆ SACERDOTALIS VACARET. Ep. 55. p. 104.

(s) —Sedis *Rome* intrepidum in SACERDOTALI CATHEDRA eo tempore cum *Tyrannus* infestus SACERDOTIBUS DEI fanda atq; infanda Comminaretur; cumq; multo patientius & tolerabilius audiret levare adversus se æmulum Principem quam constitui *Rome* DEI SACERDOTE. *Ibid.* viz. p. 104.

§ XXVI.

AND hence (I mean from the Episcopal *Chair's* being a *Symbol* of the Ecclesiastical Sovereignty) it was, that when *Novatianus* pretended to be Bishop of Rome, St. Cyprian expressed his Usurpation by setting up an ADULTEROUS CHAIR, (t) and for doing so, made him more Criminal than

(t) *Supra.*
§ XVI. (z)

Core,

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c. 255

Core, Dathan and Abiron. (u) Indeed, he makes his set-
 ting up ANOTHER CHAIR, one and the same thing with
 assuming a Primacy, and Vindicating to himself a Sovereign
 and Independent Power of the Sacraments. (v) And in ano-
 ther place he resents it thus: *What Reasoning is this, Nova-*
tianus doth so or so? therefore, we should not do so. What?
shall we Renounce our Chairs (i. e. plainly our Episcopal So-
vereignty) because Novatianus usurps the Honour of the SA-
 CERDOTAL CHAIR? (w) Because he pretends to be a Bi-
 shop? In short, let any Man consider St. Cyprian's Accounts
 of the EPISCOPAL CHAIR; how he always makes it a
 Symbol of the High-Priesthood; that to *usurp* it was to *usurp*
 the High-Priesthood; that to forfeit it was to forfeit the
 High Priesthood; that to set up ANOTHER CHAIR, in op-
 position to the ONE CHAIR, to the ONE BISHOPS
 CHAIR, was to set up another Altar, another Communion,
 another Church, other Sacraments, other Sacrifices, &c.
 Let any Man, I say, consider these things, and let him say,
 if he can, that the CHAIR was not a Symbol of a Majority
 of Power as well as of Dignity.

(v) CATHE-
 DRAM sibi
 constituere
 & Primatum
 assumere, &
 Baptizandi
 atq; Offerendi
 Licentiam
 vindicare. Ibid.
 (w) Quale est
 autem ut quia
 hoc Novatia-
 nus facere au-
 det nos pute-
 mus non esse
 faciendum?
 Quid ergo,
 quia & Hono-
 rem CATHE-
 DRÆ SA-
 CERDOTA-

LIS Novatianus Usurpat, num iccirio Nos CATHEDRÆ renunciare debemus—Ep. 73.
 p. 199.

WHAT hath been already discoursed, might in all reason § XXVII.
 be enough to answer my Design; to prove, that by the Prin-
 ciples of the Cyprianic Age, the Bishop had a Majority of
 Power, &c. Indeed, to Muster up all his Prerogatives, all
 the Arguments deducible from those Principles, would make a
 tedious work; e.g. how easy were it to prove, by the plainest
 Testimonies, that he was Father to, and had a Paternal
 Power over all the Christians, Clergy and Laity, within his
 District? (x) That he was PAPA, (y) Pontifex, (z) Antistes (x) Ep. 41.
 or Prelate, (a) Doctor, (b) Dux or Chieftain, (c) Head, (y) Ep. 8.
 (d) Rector, (e) Signifer, (f) Physician, at least, in Chief, (y) Ep. 8.
 (g) Dispensator, (h) Procurator. (i) All these Names and Ep. 31. p. 61.
 Titles, and Prerogatives, and many more such, he had either (z) Pont. Vit.
 Appropriated to himself, or belonging to him in a more Cyp.
 eminent sense than could agree to Presbyters. But I shall (a) Ep. 61.
 mention only a few more, which laid together, may for ever p. 144.
 extinguish this Controversy. Ep. 66. p. 167.
 (b) Ep. 77.
 p. 234.

(c) Ep. 60. p. 141. Ep. 61. p. 144. (d) Ep. 45. p. 86. (e) Ep. 59. p. 133. Ep. 61. p. 144.
 Ep. 66. p. 169. (f) Pont. vit. Cyp. (g) De Lapsis, p. 128. Ep. 36. p. 70. Ep. 55. p. 107.
 (h) Ep. 59. p. 129. Ep. 67. p. 173. (i) De Lapsis, p. 123.

VI. THEN

- § XXVIII. VI. THEN, what more obvious in the *Cyprianic* Monuments, than that, by the then current Principles, a Bishop was PRÆPOSITUS, that is, RULER or SUPERIOUR to all the *Clergy* (*Presbyters* not excepted) as well as to the *People*? Nothing plainer than this in our *Martyrs* Congratulation to the *Roman* *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, after the Death of *Fabianus*. I cited a part of the Testimony in my former Book, but I did not translate it: I only said that *St. Cyprian* prais'd the *Roman* *Clergy* for having the Memory of *Fabianus*, who had been their SUPERIOUR, in so great Honour.
- (k) p. 72. (k) 'Tis a Mistake, (says G. R.) he calleth him simply PRÆPOSITUS, a Title which (he says) he has shew'd was given to *Presbyters* as well as *Bishops*. (l) And true it is indeed, he had before been at pains to prove, that *Presbyters* were sometimes called PRÆPOSITI, (m) as if any Man had ever denied it. For my part, I do very readily grant it: But then I do affirm, that the same Title is sometimes allowed to *Deacons*. So that G. R. when he casts up his Accounts, if he does it accurately, is like to make but very small Advantage of such an Observation. *Deacons*, I say, are sometimes comprehended under the General Name of *Præpositi*. This will be evident to any, who considers and compares the Epistles written by our Martyr to his *Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the time of his Retirement, particularly *Ep. 15.* and *16.* (n) In short, most, if not all of the Epistles relating to the common Concerns of the Church, written by him in those Days of his Secession, are directed not to his *Presbyters*, but to his *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. (o) And who so seriously considers them, will find that *Deacons* as well as *Presbyters*, were intrusted with a Subordinate Administration of Discipline. (p) That they were Pastors, if we may call them *Pastors*, to whom the
- (n) *Ep. 15. p. 33. Sic Scribit Noster ad Martyres. Et Credideram quidem Presbyteros & Diaconos qui illic præsentibus sunt Monere vos & instruere. Dein, paucis interjectis hæc, sed PRÆPOSITORUM est præceptum tenere & vel properantes vel ignorantes instruere ne qui Ovium PASTORES esse debeant Lanii fiant, p. 34. En tam Diaconos quam Presbyteros cum PRÆPOSITOS tum PASTORES appellatos: præsertim si Consulamus, Ep. 16. p. 38. ubi sic Noster. Si Martyres per Calorem Gloriæ Scripturam minus Contemplant, contra Legem Dei plus aliquid Cuperent, à Presbyteris & Diaconis Suggestentibus admoneri deberent.*
- (o) Vide *Ep. 5. 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 26, 29, 32, 34, 38, 39, 40.*
- (p) *Ep. 5. sic inscribitur, Cyprianus Presbyteris & Diaconibus fratribus Carissimis, dein sic in Epistola legitur. Quoniam mihi interesse nunc non permittit LOCI conditio, peto vos (tam Diaconos quam Presbyteros) pro fide & Religione vestra fungamini illic & vestris partibus & meis, ut nihil vel ad DISCIPLINAM vel ad DILIGENTIAM Desit. p. 10.*

Sheep were committed: (q) That they were said to GOVERN, (q) Vos qui-
(r) to RULE, (s) to be OVER the Flock: (t) That they dem (Plebem
could Absolve Penitents, &c. (u) Briefly, they were, all alloquitar) no-
that time, Conjunct with the Presbyters in the Ordinary Acts stri Presbyteri
of Government. So it was also at Rome, as appears from & Diaconi
the Epistles written by the Roman Clergy to St. Cyprian, and monere debu-
by St. Cyprian to the Roman Clergy. (v) But will it there- erant, ut com-
fore follow, that Deacons Acted in parity with Presbyters? mendatas sibi
But if this will not follow, how will it follow, that because OVES fove-
Presbyters are sometimes called PRÆPOSITI, therefore they rent & divino
Acted in parity with Bishops? How easy is it to understand, Magisterio ad
that there may be many Præpositi, Rulers, and yet one may viam depre-
be Præpositus to all the other Præpositi? Now I do affirm, candæ Salutis
that the Bishop was such a Præpositus: And I do affirm that instruerent.
the above-mentioned Congratulation to the Roman Presbyters Ep. 17. p. 59.
and Deacons, is a manifest Demonstration of it. The Mat- (r) —ut Dia-
ter, in short, is this: coni ad Car-
cerem Com-
meantes, Mar-
tyrum Consi-
lia Consiliis
suis & Scrip-
turarum præceptis GUBERNARENT.—Ep. 15. p. 33. (s) Doleo quando audio quosdam—
nec à Diaconis nec à Presbyteris REGI posse, &c. Ep. 14. p. 32:

(t) Sed nunc illi Rei non sunt (ni Lapsi) qui minus Scripturæ legem tenent. Erunt autem
Rei qui PRÆSUNT & hæc fratribus non suggerunt, ut instructi à PRÆPOSITIS faciant
omnia cum Dei timore, &c. Ep. 16. p. 37. En non solum dictum de Diaconis quod PRÆES-
SENT, sed etiam rursus eosdem dictos PRÆPOSITOS.

(u) Vel si Presbyter repertus non fuerit & Urgere exitus Cæperit, apud DIACONUM
quoq; exomologesin facere delicti sui possint ut manu iis in penitentia imposita veniant ad
Dominum cum pace. Ep. 18. p. 40, 41.

(v) Vide Ep. 9, 20, 27, 30, 35, 36.

FABIANUS Bishop of Rome, having died the Glorious § XXIX.
Death of a Martyr, the Roman Presbyters and Deacons, by
a Letter, give an Honourable Account of it to St. Cyprian:
And he begins his Answer to them to this purpose. When
the Death of that Good Man my COLLEAGUE was uncertainly
talked of here, I received yours, most dear Brethren, by Cle-
mentius the Subdeacon, whereby I was more fully informed of
his Glorious departure.—And I do exceedingly rejoyce in your
behalf, that you do Honour his Memory with such a Notable
and Illustrious Testimony; and have made us know that which
is not only to us an Example of Faith and Courage, but also to
your selves Glorious, in as much as you Honour the Memory
of your SUPERIOUR. For as the Fall of a SUPERIOUR
may be of dangerous Influence, and occasion the Fall of his
SUBJECTS, so, on the other hand, 'tis as much Profitable and

Encouraging, when a BISHOP, by the Stability of his Faith, sets himself a Pattern to the Brethren. You have our Martyrs own words on the Margent. (w) And if they do not fairly, and not only fairly, but necessarily bear, that *Fabianus* was *PRÆPOSITUS*, *Superiour* to the *Roman Clergy*, *Presbyters* as well as *Deacons*, let any Man judge. So much, indeed, their *Superiour* he had been, that even themselves being Witnesses, had he been alive, he could have ordered such and such Matters, which, now that he was dead, could not be ordered, till another succeeding to him, by the strictest Laws of *Singular Succession*, bearing the same *Character* which he had born, and *Enabled* with the same *Powers* and *Prerogatives* which had *Enabled* him while alive, *should Order them*. (x) But this is not the only Testimony by which the Bishop's being *PRÆPOSITUS*, *Superiour* to *Presbyters*, may be demonstrated: You may find, I cannot tell how many more, if you turn over the *Cyprianic Monuments*. I shall only adduce some three or four, which may be sufficient to stop the Mouth of Impudence it self. E. G.

(w) Cum de excessu Boni viri COLLEGÆ MEI rumor apud nos incertus esset: accepi à vobis literas ad me missas per Clementium Hypodiaconum quibus plenissime de Glorioso ejus exitu instrueretur in quo vobis quoque plurimum gratulor quod ejus Memoriam tam Celebri & illustri testimo-

nio prosequa mini ut per vos innotesceret nobis quod & vobis circa *PRÆPOSITI* Memoriam Gloriosum & nobis quoque fidei & Virtutis præberet Exemplum. Nam quantum perniciose est ad *SEQUENTIUM* Lapsum ruina *PRÆPOSITI*, in tantum contra utile est & Salutare cum se *EPISCOPUS* per firmamentum fidei fratribus præbet imitandum. Ep. 9. p. 18, 19. Vide n. *Fabianum* aperte *Cypriani COLLEGAM* dictum? Vide ne Eundem dictum *EPISCOPUM*? *Fabianus* ne *Romanus* fuerat *Episcopus*? *PRÆPOSITUS* ne, proinde, non solum plebi, sed & *Presbyteris* & *Diaconis*, qui etiam inter *SEQUENTES* Numerandi?

(x) Quanquam nobis differendæ hujus rei NECESSITAS major incumbat quibus post excessum Nobilissimæ Memorix viri *Fabiani* nondum est *EPISCOPUS* propter rerum & temporum difficultates constitutus qui omnia ista Moderetur, & eorum qui Lapsi sunt possit cum AUCTORITATE & CONSILIO habere rationem. Ep. 30. p. 58, 59. & rursus, p. 60, ante Constitutionem *EPISCOPI* nihil innovandum putavimus, sed Lapsorum curam Mediocriter temperandam esse credidimus, ut interim dum *EPISCOPUS* dari à Deo nobis sustinetur, in suspenso eorum qui moras possunt dilationis sustinere causa teneatur. Quid apertius hisce Continetur Testimoniis quam *EPISCOPUM* adeo *Presbyteris* fuisse *PRÆPOSITUM*, adeo Majori supra quam gauderent *Presbyteri* potestate fuisse Gavisum, ut qua illi nullo modo possent, penes ipsum esset Disponere?

§ XXX. ARE not *Bishops* as *PRÆPOSITI*, or *Superiours*, most plainly Contradistinguished from all the other *Clergy*, and particularly from *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, in his 19th Epistle?

(y) Hoc enim (y) Is not the same notable distinction made again by him, & verecundiæ & Disciplinæ & vitæ ipsi omnium nostrum Convenit ut *PRÆPOSITI* cum *CLERO* convenientes, &c. Ep. 19. p. 42.

Ep. 20. written to the Roman Presbyters and Deacons? I plainly commanded the Causes of other Lapsers (says he) to be delayed, and reserved till I myself might be present, that when the Lord shall send us peace, and many of us PRÆPOSITI, that is plainly Bishops, may meet, our Resolutions being also communicated to you, we may Order and Reform things, &c.

(2) And Ep. 13. written to Rogatianus a Carthaginian Presbyter, and the rest of the Confessors, he bespeaks them to this purpose: What greater or better thing can I wish for, than to see the Flock of Christ illuminated by the Honour of your Confession? For as it is the Duty of all the Brethren to rejoice on this account, so particularly the Bishop's Portion of the common joy is greater, in as much as the Glory of the Church is the SUPERIOUR's Glory. (a) Have we not here the Bishop most evidently represented as a Singular SUPERIOUR? And what do you think of our Martyr's 16th Epistle written to his Presbyters and Deacons? Some Presbyters, without his Allowance, had presumed to Absolve some Lapsers, and admit them to the Sacrament. How keenly does he resent this? And resenting it, how irresistibly does he Assert the Bishop's being SUPERIOUR to Presbyters? What reason have we to be afraid of the wrath of God, (says he) when some PRESBYTERS, neither mindful of their own STATION, nor regardful of the BISHOP, THEIR SUPERIOUR for the time, are bold to assume all to themselves, to the reproach and contempt of their SUPERIOUR, a thing never heretofore attempted under any of my Predecessors? G. R. may as wisely attempt to swallow Mountains, or drink up the Ocean, as to elude the Force, or obscure the Evidence of the Testimony as ye have it on the Margent. (b) Once more, It is certain St. Cyprian levelled against the same presumptuous Presbyters, in his Excellent Discourse De Zelo & Livore, and particularly in that notable Passage which you have on the Margent, (c) and runs thus in Scottish as near as I can

(2) Planè exterorum causas -- differri mandavi, & in nostram præsentiam referri ut cum pace à Domino nobis data plures PRÆPOSITI convenire in unum Capere inus communicato etiam VOBISCUM Concilio disponere singula & Reformare possimus.

Ep. 20. p. 43, 44.

(a) Quid enim vel Majus in votis meis potest esse vel melius quam cum video Confessionis vestrae honore in lumen Gregem Christi? Nam cum gaudere in hoc omnes fratres oportet,

tum in gaudio Communi Major est EPISCOPI PORTIO. Ecclesie enim Gloria PRÆPOSITI Gloria est. Ep. 13. p. 28.

(b) Quod enim non periculum Metuere debemus de offensa Domini, quando aliqui de PRESBYTERIS nec Evangelii nec LOCI SUI memores sed neq; futurum Domini iudicium, neq; nunc sibi PRÆPOSITUM EPISCOPUM Cogitantes, quod nunquam omnino sub Antecessoribus factum est, cum Contumelia & Contemptis PRÆPOSITI totum sibi vindicent? &c. Ep. 13. p. 36.

(c) Hinc Dominici pacis Vinculum rumpitur, hinc Caritas fraterna violatur, hinc adulteratur Veritas, Unitas scinditur, ad Hæreses atq; ad Schismata profilitur, dum obrectatur SA-

CERDOTIBUS, dum EPISCOPIS invidetur, cum quis aut quæritur non se potius Ordinat-
tum, aut dedignatur alterum ferre PRÆPOSITUM. Hinc recalcitrat, hinc rebellat de Zelo
superbus, de æmulatione perversus, animositate & Livore non HOMINIS sed HONORIS ini-
micus. De Zelo & Livore, p. 223.

Translate it. *The Breach of the Bond of our Lords Peace, The Violation of Brotherly Love, The Adulteration of the Truth, The Cutting of Unity, The Breaking out into Heresies and Schisms: All these do hence proceed, that the PRIESTS are Disparaged, that the BISHOPS are Envied: (Here is another Instance of equivalent Phrases) When any Man is Angry that himself was not rather Ordained, and cannot endure to have another his SUPERIOUR. It had been easy, as I have said, to have adduced many more Testimonies to this purpose, but these may satisfy any Man who is capable of satisfaction. I proceed,*

§ XXXI.

VII. BY the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, the Bishop was GUBERNATOR, i.e. *Steers-man* of the Ship of the Church. He sat at the Helm, and managed the GUBERNACULUM. The Roman Presbyters and Deacons, do prettily insist on this Metaphor, Ep. 30. (d) They praise St. Cyprian, that all along, especially in the difficult Case of the Lapsers, he had *Steered* with a steady Hand, and they Exhort and Encourage him to continue in the prosecution of such Measures. And St. Cyprian tells Pomponius, Ep. 4. that *the Ship* (the Church whereof he was Bishop) *must be watchfully guided by him, that she be not dash'd in pieces upon the Rocks, &c.* (e) And again, to Cornelius, Ep. 59. that Satan's design in tempting Men to turn Schismaticks and Antibishops, is, *that the True STEERS-MAN, (the true Bishop) being removed, the Church may be Shipwrack'd.* (f) And Ep. 61. he expresses great Joy that Lucius, Bishop of Rome, was

magis, aut in pace tam ap-
tum, aut in bel-
lis persecutio-
nis, tam neces-
sarium quam
debitam seve-
ritatem Divi-
ni vigoris te-
nere, quam qui
remiserit, in-
stabili rerum
cursu erret
semper ne-
cesse est; &
huc atq; illuc variis & in certis Negotiorum tempestatibus dissipetur; & quasi extor-
to de Manibus Consiliorum GUBERNACULO, navem Ecclesiasticæ Salutis illidat in Scopulos:
ut appareat non aliter Saluti Ecclesiasticæ Consuli posse nisi si qui & contra ipsam faciant
quasi quidam adversi fluctus rebellantur, & Disciplinæ ipsius semper Custodita ratio quasi Sa-
lutare aliquod GUBERNACULUM in tempestate Servetur. Ep. 30. p. 56.

(e) Liberanda est vigilanter de periculos locis NAVIS ne inter Scopulos & Saxa frangatur, &c. Ep. 4. p. 8.

(f) Apparet quis impugnet — Non Sciz. Christus qui SACERDOTES aut Constituit aut Protegit, sed ille qui Christi Adversarius & Ecclesiæ ejus inimicus ad hoc Ecclesiæ PRÆ-
POSITUM sua infestatione prosequatur ut GUBERNATORE sublato atrocius atq; Violentius circa Ecclesiæ Naufragia grassetur. Ep. 59. p. 130.

safely returned to his Station, seeing thereby the PASTOR was restored to the FLOCK, the STEERS-MAN to the SHIP, and the RULER to the PEOPLE. (g) And Ep. 66. he makes it unaccountable in *Florentius Papianus*, that he should have called in Question his *Episcopal Authority*, seeing to do so, was in effect to say, that for six Years, the Church had no STEERS-MAN. (h) I do not know what an *Idea G. R.* may have of his *Beloved Parity*, but I doubt much it would not do well in a Ship. I believe it has not been often tried there. I believe even the Dutch themselves, as much as they may be for Democracy on dry Land, do yet allow of Monarchy in every Ship while she is at Sea. But to forbear such Excursions, tho' divers other Testimonies might be adduced to our purpose, yet these may be sufficient to shew, that in St. Cyprian's Time, a Bishop in a Church was the same that the Master is in a Ship, and by consequence, that he had not only more Dignity, but also more Power, than any other Person in it. Near of Kin to this it is,

(g) Sed & nunc non minus tibi & Comitibus tuis atq; Universæ fraternitati gratulamur quod cum eadem Gloria & laudibus vestris Reduces vos denuo ad suos fecerit benigna Domini & larga Protectione, ut Pascendo GREGI PASTOR, & GUBERNANDÆ

NAVI GUBERNATOR, & PLEBI Regendæ RECTOR redderetur. Ep. 61. p. 144.
(b) Vide Supra, § VII. (g)

VIII. THAT by the Principles of that Age, Bishops, as § XXXII. making a distinct Order from Presbyters, had in their hands the BALANCE of Government to be managed at their Discretion. They were the Governours who WEIGHED Matters, and PONDERED Counsels, Adjusted Expedients, and Adapted Rules and Orders, and Measures, to the Churches Exigencies. So we read in many places particularly Ep. 55. (i) Ep. 64. (k) and Ep. 68. (l) But of this more fully here after. (m) I hope I need not be at pains to shew that this Prerogative is an Argument of more Power in Bishops, as well as more Dignity.

(i) De eo tamē quod statuendum esset circa lapsorum Causam, distuli, ut cum

quies & tranquillitas data esset, & EPISCOPIIS in unum convenire indulgentia Divina permitteret, tunc communicato & LIBRATO de omnium (n' Episcoporum qui Convenirent) Consilio STATUERIMUS quod fieri oporteret — & Paulo post, in unum (Episcopi, hoc enim totius Orationis ratio postulat.) Convenimus, & Scripturis diu ex utraq; parte prolatis, TEMPERAMENTUM SALUBRI MODERATIONE LIBRAVIMUS.

(k) Cyprianus & Cateri COLLEGÆ qui in Concilio affuerunt Numero 66. LIBRATO apud se diu CONSILIO, satis esse aiunt Objurgare Therapium, &c. Ep. 64. p. 158.

(l) Cui rei Nostrium (Episcoporum) est Consulere & Subvenire F. C. (Stephanum alloquitur Noster, Episcopum Sciz. Romanum) qui Divinam Clementiam cogitantes & GUBERNANDÆ ECCLESIAE LIBRAM TENENTES, sic Censuram vigoris peccatoribus exhibemus, ut

tam Lapis erigendis & Curandis vulneratis, Bonitatis & Misericordiae Divinae Medicinam non denegemus. Ep. 68. p. 176, 177.

(m) Vide infra, Chap. VII.

§ XXXIII. IX. NOTHING plainer in the Cyprianic Monuments, than that the Bishop as such was the HIGH PRIEST. I shall readily grant that *Presbyters* were also called *Priests*. But nothing more obvious, almost in every Page, than that the *Bishop* were SACERDOS, *Priest* by way of *Eminence*. No Name more frequently given him; given him frequently with distinguishing Additions. Sometimes he is called SACERDOS DEI, *the Priest of God*. (n) Sometimes SACERDOS DOMINI, *the Priest of our Lord*. (o) And his Office is called SACERDOTIUM, *the Priesthood*; and SACERDOTIUM DEI, *God's Priesthood*. (p) In short, it was a *Singular Priesthood*. There could not be Two such *Priests* or *Priesthoods*, at once, in any one Church; that is, in any one City, with its Territory, how populous soever, and yet there might have been very many *subordinate Priests* and *Priesthoods*, as many as there were *Presbyters*; than which, there cannot be a clearer Demonstration, That the *Bishop* was the HIGH PRIEST, and his Office the HIGH PRIESTHOOD. Indeed, by the then current Principles, (as I have elsewhere fully proved) (q) the Bishop was as much the *High Priest*, in his own *District*, as *Aaron* and his *Successors* were in *Jewry*. And, how zealously, how keenly, how frequently doth *St. Cyprian*, in his Reasonings against the *Schismatics* of his Time, insist on the ONE PRIEST, and the ONE PRIESTHOOD, and the ONE ALTAR? I have given a sufficient Specimen of such Reasonings on the Margent. (r) And what less can be necessarily imported by them, than that by the then current Principles, There could be but ONE PRIEST in CHIEF, and ONE PRIESTHOOD in CHIEF, and ONE ALTAR in CHIEF? And that there could be no Lawful, no Hallowed PRIESTS, nor PRIESTHOODS, nor ALTARS, in any one particular Church or City, but such as were *Subordinate* to, and *Depended* on the ONE CHIEF PRIEST, and the ONE CHIEF PRIESTHOOD, and the ONE CHIEF ALTAR? Indeed,

(r) An esse fibi cum Christo videtur qui adversus SACERDOTES CHRISTI facit? qui se à Cleri ejus & plebis Societate Secernit? Arma ille contra Ecclesiam portat, contra Dei Dispositi-

onem repugnat, HOSTIS ALTARIS, adversus Sacrificium Christi Rebellis, pro fide perfidus, pro Religione Sacrilegus, in obsequens Servus, filius impius, frater inimicus, contemptis EPISCOPIS & DEI SACERDOTIBUS derelictis constituere audet ALIUD ALTARE, Pre-

W H E N

cem ALTERAM illicitis vocibus facere, Dominicæ Hostiæ veritatem per FALSA SACRIFICIA profanare, &c. *De Unit. Eccl.* p. 116.

Hæc sunt enim initia Hæreticorum & Ortus atq; Conatus Schismaticorum male cogitantium, ut sibi placeant & PRÆPOSITUM superbo tumore contemnant. Sic de Ecclesia receditur, sic ALTARE PROFANUM FORIS Collocatur, sic contra pacem Christi & Ordinationem atq; Unitatem Dei rebellatur. *Ep.* 3. p. 6.

Deus UNUS est & Christus UNUS & UNA Ecclesia & Cathedra UNA Super Petrum Domini voce fundata. ALIUD ALTARE constitui aut NOVUM SACERDOTIUM fieri præter UNUM ALTARE & UNUM SACERDOTIUM non potest. *Ep.* 43. p. 83.

Et cum ad nos in Africam Legatos misisset (*Novatianus*) optans ad Communicationem Nostram admitti; hinc à Concilio plurimorum SACERDOTUM (*i. e. Episcoporum*) qui præsentibus eramus, Sententiam retulerit, se FORIS esse Capisse, nec posse à quoquam Nostrum sibi Communicari qui EPISCOPO Cornelio in Catholica Ecclesia, de Dei Judicio, & Cleri ac plebis Suffragio Ordinato, PROFANUM ALTARE erigere & Adulteram Cathedram Collocare & SACRILEGA contra VERUM SACERDOTE SACRIFICIA offerre tentaverit. *Ep.* 68. p. 177.

Si autem qui Ecclesiam contemnunt, Ethnici & Publicani habentur, multo magis utiq; Rebelles & Hostes, FALSA ALTARIA & ILLICITA SACERDOTIA & Nomina adulterata fingentes, inter Ethnicos & Publicanos necesse est computentur—*Ep.* 69. p. 180, 181.

Addimus plane & adjungimus *F. C.* consensu & auctoritate communi, ut etiam si qui Presbyteri aut Diaconi qui vel in Ecclesia Catholica prius Ordinati fuerint, & post modum perfidi ac Rebelles contra Ecclesiam steterint, vel apud Hæreticos à pseudo episcopis & Antichristis, contra Christi Dispositionem profana Ordinatione promoti sint, & contra ALTARE UNUM atq; Divinum Sacrificia FORIS falsa ac Sacrilega offerre Conati sint, eos quoq; hac conditione suscipi cum revertantur, ut communicent Laici, &c. *Ep.* 72. p. 197.

Eadem, iisdemq; nexa principiis, planissime Firmilianus. Hostes autem unius Ecclesiæ Catholicæ in qua Nos sumus, & ADVERSARII NOSTRI qui APOSTOLIS SUCCESSIMUS, SACERDOTIA sibi ILLICITA contra Nos vindicantes, & ALTARIA PROFANA ponentes quid aliud sunt quam Core, Dathan & Abiron, pari scelere Sacrilegi, &c. *Hæc, inquam, ille.* *Ep.* 75. p. 225. Plura hæc facientia Testimonia huic Cunnulo adjecisse facillimum fuisset, sed in re tam liquida quid pluribus opus?

WHEN St. Cyprian so frequently called the Bishop, The § XXXIV Priest, The Priest of God, The Priest of our Lord, The One Priest, &c. when he insisted so zealously on the One Altar, and the One Priesthood, who can doubt whether he meant the same thing with his Master Tertullian, who calls the Bishop, in express Terms, SUMMUS SACERDOS, The Highest Priest? Who can doubt, I say, that the Bishop was the same PRIEST to St. Cyprian, that he was to Tertullian? But to Tertullian he was so much the CHIEF PRIEST, that the Presbyters, or Inferiour Priests, could no more than Deacons, Baptize without his Allowance; which is either an Argument of more Power, or we must yet be to seek what more Power can be. 'Tis true, G. R. has endeavoured to elude the force of Tertullian's Testimony by very surprizing Glosses, (*s*) but they are not worth the Reciting; and the principal one I shall have occasion afterward to consider. (*s*) Cyp. P. Exam. p. 72. (*t*) And

(t) Infra, cap.
VIII. § 1, II,
&c.

(u) Supra, cap.
3. fusc.

(v) Superest
ad concluden-
dam materio-
lam, de obser-
vatione quoq;
Dandi & Ac-
cipiendi Bap-
tismum com-
mune facere.
Dandi quidem
jus habet
SUMMUS

SACERDOS qui est EPISCOPUS : DE HINC Presbyteri & Diaconi : Non tamen sine
EPISCOPI AUCTORITATE. *Tert. de Bapt. cap. 17.*

§ XXXV. AND what else can be the true meaning of the SUB-
LIME SACERDOTII FASTIGIUM, mentioned by St. Cy-
prius, Ep. 55. than the Episcopal HIGH PRIESTHOOD?
I had only mentioned this Phrase before, and G. R. says he
cannot find it: Now I do tell him, he may find it in that
most Notable Epistle written to *Antonianus*, the 52d accor-
ding to *Pamelius's* Numbers. And if G. R. will be pleased
to consider the whole period, as it is here on the Margent,

(w) Nam quod
Cornelium
Carissimum
Nostrum Deo

(w) I hope he will not be so wilful as not to acknowledge
all I did before, and do now adduce it for. *That which*
& Christo & Ecclesie ejus item Consacerdotibus cunctis commendat; non iste ad EPIS-
COPATUM subito pervenit; sed per OMNIA OFFICIA ECCLESIASTICA PROMOTUS,
& in Divinis administrationibus. Dominum saepe promeritus, ad SACERDOTII SUBLIME
FASTIGIUM CUNCTIS Religionis GRADIBUS ASCENDIT. Ep. 55. p. 103.

commends

(t) And therefore, at present, it is enough to tell him that
Tertullian's words are so plain, that no Glosses can obscure
them. So very plain, that *Blondel*, *Salmasius*, *Dallæus*, *Ju-
nius*, *Rivetius*, *Leidecker*, &c. in short, all the Learned
Presbyterians I have had occasion to see, have ever under-
stood them as undeniably importing a Majority of Power in
the days of *Tertullian*. (u) Never Author, so far as I have
observed, before G. R. attempted to reconcile them with
the *Presbyterian Scheme*, or make them consistent with the
Principles of parity. No Author will ever attempt it, who
has not resolved to run the risque of his Reputation, by fly-
ing in the face of Common Sense: For, however obscure or
rugged, in other places, *Tertullian's* Stile may be, yet, no-
thing plainer, smoother, easier, than the Testimony we are
now concern'd about. You have it here again on the Mar-
gent; (v) and in it, these Things as clear as the Mid-day
Sun. 1. That in *Tertullian's* Time, the Bishop was the
HIGH PRIEST. 2. That as such he had the Chief Power of
Baptism. He had it so much, 3. That neither *Presbyter* nor
Deacon could *Baptize* without his Allowance. Can they ever
gain Credit with Men of common Discretion, or common
Ingenuity, whose Obstinacy prompts them to resist Evidence
so very Bright and Powerful, or to intricate Language so very
plain and peremptory?

commends Cornelius (says our Martyr) is, that he did not come suddenly to the Bishoprick, (of Rome) but that having first gone through all Inferiour Ecclesiastical Offices, and having often served our Lord faithfully in Divine Administrations, he ascended by all the Steps of his Religion to the HIGH TOP OF THE PRIESTHOOD. That is, he was not promoted *per Saltum*, as they call it, but had regularly ascended through all the Inferiour Orders: Had been an *Acolyth*, an *Exorcist*, &c. and at last a *Presbyter*, (at least nine or ten Years, even by *Blondel's* reckoning) before he was made a Bishop. This is evidently the true sense of the place; and 'tis the true meaning of the *AMPLIOR LOCUS* mentioned before. (x) And it is most appositely Glossed (if I may so say) by *Optatus Milevitanus*, in his First Book against *Parmentianus* the Donatist, as you may see on the Margent. (y) Or, if *Optatus* shall be rejected as none of St. Cyprian's Contemporaries, (tho' G. R. was so learn'd as to make him one of them) then hear *Origen*, one of his undoubted Contemporaries, (tho' G. R. makes him none of them) *More will be required of me* (a *Presbyter*, for such he was when he wrote this) *than of a Deacon: More of a Deacon than of a Laick: But he has most to account for, who has the Ecclesiastical Principality over us all*, (or, who keeps the Castle of the Church, as St. *Jerom*, comparing the Church to a City, and the Episcopal Office to the Castle that commands the City, translates it) *i. e.* the Bishop. (z)

(x) *Supra*, § 23.

(y) *Quid com-*

memorem Lai-

cos qui tunc

in Ecclesia,

nulla fuerunt

dignitate Suf-

ulti? Quid

Ministros plu-

rimos? Quid

Diaconos in

TERTIO?

Quid Presby-

teros in SE-

CUNDO SA-

CERDOTIO

constitutos? IPSI APICES & PRINCIPES OMNIUM, aliqui EPISCOPI, illis temporibus, ut damno æternæ vitæ, istius incertæ lucis moras brevissimas compararent, Instrumenta divinæ legis impie tradiderunt. *Optat. Lib. 1. fol. 6. Edit. Paris, Anno 1569.*

(z) Πλείον ἔγω ἀπαιτῶμαι παρὰ τὸ Διάκονον; πλείον ὁ Διάκονος παρὰ τὸ Λαϊκόν; ὃ δὲ τὴν πάντων ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίαν ἀντικειμένον ἔστιν ἈΡΧΗΝ αὐτῷ τῷ Ἐκκλησιαστικῷ ἐν πλείον ἀπαιτεῖται. *Origen. Hom. II. in Jerem.*

X. BY the Cyprianic Principles, the Bishop was PASTOR & XXXVI. in CHIEF: *Pastor* by way of *Eminence*, and in a sense peculiar to himself. *Presbyters*, I do readily confess, were likewise called *Pastors*: But so were *Deacons*, as I have already shewn. (a) *Presbyters* and *Deacons* were both called *Pastors*, (a) *Supra*, § 28. as *Magistrates* are called *Gods*, *Psal. 82. 1, 6.* or *Christ's* (n) *Messengers*, *Saviours*, *Obad. 21. 1 Tim. 4. 16. Jam. 5. 20.* That is, they were only *subordinate Pastors*, *Pastors dependent* on the Bishop, who was *Pastor in Chief*. And here I might insist largely, for nothing more frequently insisted on,

or more fully and pointedly discoursed in the *Cyprianick* Monuments; but, for brevity, I shall only propose three Things at present to my Reader's Observation.

§XXXVII.

(b) Doleo fratres, Doleo vobiscum, nec mihi adleniendos Dolores meos integritas propria, & Sanitas privata blanditur, quando plus PASTOR in GREGIS sui vulnere vulneretur. De Lapp. p. 123.

Optaveram quidem FF. CC. (Presbyteros suos & Diaconos alloquatur)

ut Universum Clerum Nostrium integrum & incolumem meis literis Salutare, sed quoniam infesta tempestas quæ PLEBEM NOSTRAM ex Maxima parte prostravit hunc quoq; addidit Nostriis doloribus cumulum ut etiam cleri portionem perstringeret, &c. Ep. 14. p. 31.

Ego PLEBIS nostræ & quietem Novi pariter & Timorem, &c. Ep. 17. p. 39.

Vos Orationibus frequenter insiſtite, ut Domini Misericordia favens nobis, cito PLEBI SUÆ SACERDOTEM reddat incolumem. Ep. 38. p. 75.

—Cum Episcopo portionem PLEBIS dividere, &c. Ep. 41. p. 79.

—Contra SACERDOTIUM DEI, portionem ruptæ fraternitatis armare. Ep. 43. p. 82.

—Evaristum—Succensorem PLEBI cui antea præfuerat, Zetum in locum ejus Episcopum esse constitutum, Ep. 50. p. 94. & Ep. 52. p. 96. legimus eundem Evaristum CATHE-
DRÆ & PLEBIS factum esse Extorrem.

—PLEBEM sibi de Divina Dignatione Commissam esse pronunciant plurimi Episcopi, Ep. 57. p. 117. & rursus, ibid. p. 118. Nonne Nobis vel Negligentia Segnis vel Diritia Crudelis adſcribetur in die Judicii quod PASTORES creditas & commissas NOBIS (Episcopis) OVES, nec Curare in Pace nec in acie voluerimus armare?

Sed quoniam—longe istinc excurrere & diu à PLEBE cui de Divina indulgentia Præsum, abesse non datur facultas, &c. Ep. 58. p. 120.

Caterum (Dico enim provocatus, &c.) quando Episcopus in locum Defuncti substituitur, quando POPULI UNIVERSI Suffragio in pace deligitur, quando Dei auxilio in persecutio-

II. THEY

ne protegitur, COLLEGIS omnibus fideliter Junctus, PLEBI SUÆ, in EPISCOPATU quadriennio jam probatus, &c. *Ep. 59. p. 130. vide plura ibid. p. 132. imo passim.*

(c) — Illi (n' Christo) sunt Ecclesia, PLEBS SACERDOTI adunata, & PASTORI SUO GREX adhærens; Unde scire debes EPISCOPUM in Ecclesia esse, & Ecclesiam in EPISCOPO, & si qui cum EPISCOPO non sint, in Ecclesia non esse. *Ep. 66. p. 168.*

II. THEY were committed to him as their PASTOR, §XXXVIII. (by necessary consequence, their PASTOR in CHIEF) even in populous Churches, where there were many Presbyters, many *subordinate Pastors*. Thus, there were many Presbyters in *Carthage*; yet *Cyprian* always speaks of himself as the PASTOR, and all the Christians in that great City as his FLOCK. Particularly, he condemns *Felicissimus*, and his Party, (and for any thing we have upon Record, the *major part* of the *Presbyters* of *Carthage* were of that Party) for dividing a Portion of the People from himself their Bishop, as thereby separating the SHEEP from their PASTOR, the CHILDREN from their FATHER, and *Christ's Members one from another*. (d) And *Ep. 43.* he Exhorts his People to avoid the same *Felicissimus*, and those his Complices, as *Wolves who separate the SHEEP from their SHEPHERD*. (e) And, as hath been already observed, he makes it unaccountable in *Florentius Pupianus*, that he should have called his *Episcopal Authority* in Question, seeing it was as much as to say, that the FLOCK (all the Christians in *Carthage*) for six Years, had wanted a PASTOR. (f)

(d) Vehementer contristatus sum FF. CC. acceptis vestris literis; ut cum mihi propositum semper & votum sit, Universam fraternitatem nostram incolumem continere, & illibatum GREGEM secundum quod caritas exigit, reservare; nunc Nuncietis Felicissimum—nunc quoque cum EPISCOPO portionem Plebis dividere, id est, à PASTORE OVES & FILIOS à PARENTE separare & Christi Membra dissipare tentaverit. *Ep. 41. p. 79.*

(e) Nemo vos, Fratres, errare à Domini viis faciat; Nemo vos Christianos ab Evangelio Christi rapiat: Nemo filios Ecclesiæ de Ecclesia tollat: Pereant sibi soli qui perire voluerunt: Extra Ecclesiam soli remaneant qui de Ecclesia recesserunt. Soli cum EPISCOPIS non sint qui contra EPISCOPOS rebellarunt—Discedite à talibus, quæso vos, & acquiescite Consiliis Nostri—Vitate lupos qui OVES à PASTORE scernunt, &c. *Ep. 43. p. 84.*

(f) Vide *supra*, § VII. (g)

THERE were likewise many Presbyters at *Rome*, (46 as §XXXIX. *Cornelius* tells us) yet the Bishop was the PASTOR of the whole FLOCK, of all the Christians in that most populous City. Thus, *Cornelius* was so much the ONE PASTOR, that *Novatianus*, by pretending to be Bishop, forfeited all Title to be either SHEEP or SHEPHERD. *St. Cyprian's* Reasonings to this purpose are so considerable, that I cannot for-

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

bear to lay them before the Reader. Our Lord (says he) recommending to us the Unity which proceeds from Divine Authority, saith, I and my Father are One. And again, to oblige all Christians to preserve this Unity, he saith, There shall be ONE FLOCK and ONE PASTOR. But if the FLOCK is ONE, how can he be reckoned of the FLOCK who is not numbered with the FLOCK? Or how can he be deem'd a PASTOR, who, while the TRUE PASTOR Lives and Rules the FLOCK, in an orderly Succession, succeeds to none, but begins from himself? Such an one is an Alien, is Profane, is an Enemy to Christian Peace and Unity. He dwells not in the House of God; that is, in the Church of God: None can dwell there but such as are Concordant and Unanimous. (g) Which Reasoning cannot amount to less than this, that how numerous soever the FLOCK (i. e. the whole Body of Christians of any particular Church, even Rome it self) was, whatever was the number of subordinate PASTORS, yet there could be but ONE PASTOR, having such a peculiar Relation to all the Christians of that Church, as could constitute them ONE FLOCK; that is, ONE PASTOR in CHIEF. To the same purpose, and on the same Principles, and probably against the same Novatianus, he Reasons again, in his Excellent Discourse Of the Unity of the Church. Who is so wicked, (says he) so perfidious, and so bemaddened with the Fury of Discord, as to think it Lawful, or to dare to divide the Unity of God? the Garment of our Lord? the Church of Christ? Our Lord warns and teaches us in the Gospel, saying, And there shall be ONE FLOCK, and ONE PASTOR; who then can imagine, that in ONE PLACE, (in one City, one particular Church) there can be either MANY PASTORS, or MORE FLOCKS? (h) Is not this most plainly, that by the then current Principles, there could be but ONE PASTOR in CHIEF? One Peerless Shepherd, in any one Church or City, with its

(g) Iccirco Dominus insinuans nobis unitatem de Divina auctoritate venientem, ponit & Dicit ego & Pater unum sumus; ad quam unitatem redigens Ecclesiam de-nuo dicit, & erit UNUS GREX & UNUS PASTOR. Si autem GREX unus est, quomodo potest GREGI annumerari qui in numero GREGIS non est? aut PASTOR haberi

quomodo potest, qui Manente VERO PASTORE & in Ecclesia Dei Ordinatione succidanea Præsidente, Nemini succedens & à seipso incipiens, Alienus fit & Profanus, Dominicæ PACIS ac Divinæ unitatis inimicus, non habitans in domo Dei, in quo non nisi Concordes & Unânes habitant? Ep. 69. p. 182.

(h) Quis ergo sic est Sceleratus & Perfidus, quis sic Discordiæ furore vesanus ut aut Credat scindi posse, aut audeat Scindere unitatem Dei? Vestem Domini? Ecclesiam Christi? Monet ipse in Evangelio suo & docet Dicens, & erit UNUS GREX & UNUS PASTOR; & esse posse in UNO LOCO (Romæ, nimirum, Alexandria, Antiochis, Carthagini, &c.) aliquis existimet, aut MULTOS PASTORES, aut PLURES GREGES? De Unit. Eccl. p. 110.

Territories, whatever might be the number of *Inferiour Shepherds*? Again, in that same Book, comparing a *Lapser* and a *Schismatical Bishop*, (such as *Novatianus* was) he makes the latter worse than the former. Why? *The Lapser* (says he) *is sensible that he has sinned, and he mourns for it; but the Schismatick, proud of his sin, and delighting in his wickedness, separates the Children from their Mother, (the Church) entices the SHEEP to forsake their SHEPHERD, and disturbs the Divine Ordinances.* (i) And (as has been already observed) he makes *Lucius Bishop of Rome*, not only *Master of the Ship*, and *Rector of the People*, but also *PASTOR of the FLOCK*, of all the Christians in that most populous City. (k) Nor was this peculiar to *Rome* or *Carthage*, it was so all the World over, as might easily be proved, if it were needful.

(i) Certe peccasse se hic (Lapsus) intelligit & Lamentatur & plangit. Ille (Schismaticus, Pseudo Episcopus) tumens in peccato suo sollicitat, Dei

& in ipsis sibi delictis placens, à Matre filios segregat, OVES à PASTORE Sacramenta disturbat. *Ibid.* p. 117.

(k) *Vide supra*, § XXXI. (g) *Et statim, infra*, § XL. (l)

III. NOW, whatsoever force the preceding Testimonies § XL. and Reasonings do prove, that in every Church there was ONE PASTOR in CHIEF, with the same, they prove that he was CHIEF in POWER, as well as in DIGNITY. Indeed, a CHIEFETRY of *bare Dignity*, can never bear such Reasonings. What can be more silly, or more childish, than to say, Every Church made one FLOCK, because there was but one PASTOR in it, who had the Door of the Rest, or was the Mouth of the Meeting, or so? On the other hand, nothing more solid than to infer, That every Church made one Flock, from its being subject to one Pastor, who had the Sovereign, the chief Power of Government. In short, you may as soon expect to Reconcile G. R. and me, as to point of Principle, concerning Church Government, as you can Reconcile the aforesaid Testimonies with a *bare Majority of Dignity*. For Instance, Let us take the very last, the Address to *Lucius Bishop of Rome*, and consider how it runs. *We did lately rejoyce in your behalf* (says our Martyr to him) *Dear Brother, when, by the Divine Vouchsafement, you was doubly Honoured, by being made both a Confessor and a BISHOP. And now we do as much rejoyce in the behalf of thee, and thy Companions, and the whole Fraternity, that the bountiful and*
ample

ample Protection of Our Lord, has restored you to your People without any diminution of your Glory or Praise; for so thou, who art the PASTOR, art restored to the FLOCK; thou, who art the STEERS-MAN, art restored to the SHIP; and thou, who art the RECTOR, art restored to the People: And it appears that thy Banishment has been so over-ruled by God, as that the Result should be, Not that by thy Banishment the Church should want a Bishop, but that the Bishop should return to the Church, Greater, after being Banished. (l) What

(l) Et nuper quidem tibi. F.C. gratulatus sum cum te Honore geminato in Ecclesiæ suæ administratione, Confessorem pariter & SACERDOTEM Constituit Divina Dignatio; sed & nunc non minus tibi & Comitibus tuis atq; Universæ fraternitati gratulamur, quod cum eadem gloria & Laudibus vestris, Reduces vos denuo ad suos fecerit benigna Domini & larga Protectio: ut Pascendo GREGI PASTOR, & GUBERNANDÆ

NAVI GUBERNATOR & PLEBI REGENDÆ RECTOR redderetur, & appareret Relegationem vestram sic Divinitus esse dispositam, non ut Episcopus relegatus & pulsus Ecclesiæ deesset sed ut ad Ecclesiā major rediret. Ep. 61. p. 144.

(m) Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, & æquum sit pariter ac justum ut unusquisq; causam illic dicat, ubi est Crimen admissum & SINGULIS PASTORIBUS, PORTIO GREGIS sit adscripta quam UNUS QUISQUE REGAT & GUBERNET, Rationem ACTUS SUI DOMINO REDDITURUS, &c. Ep. 59. p. 136.

(n) Neq; enim sic Putamina quædam Colligenda sunt ut quæ integra & sana sunt vulnerentur; Nec utilis & Consultus est PASTOR qui ita Morbidas & Contagiosas OVES GREGI admisceat, ut GREGEM totum mali adhaerentis afflictatione contaminet. Ep. 59. p. 137.

XI. BY

(o) Quos Constat hic (in Ecclesia Catholica) Baptizatos esse, & à nobis ad Hæresin transisse, si post modum peccato suo Cognito & errore digesto, ad veritatem & Matricem redeat, satis sit in pœnitentiam manum imponere, ut OVIS fuerat hanc OVEM abalienatam & Errabundam in OVILE suum PASTOR recipiat. Ep. 71. p. 194.

Observatur itaq; à nobis & tenetur explorata & perspecta veritate, ut omnis qui à quacunq; hæresi ad Ecclesiam Convertuntur, Ecclesiæ unico Baptismo legitimo baptizentur, exceptis his qui Baptizati in Ecclesia prius fuerant, & sic ad Hæreticos transierant, hos enim oportet cum redeunt, actâ pœnitentiâ, per manus impositionem recipi, & in OVILE unde erraverant à PASTORE restitui. Ep. 74. p. 216.

XI. BY the Cyprianic Principles, the Bishop was the § XLI.
JUDGE, the ONE JUDGE, the ONE JUDGE who REPRESENTED CHRIST, who JUDGED as CHRIST's VICAR, within his own District; which must import, at least, that he was JUDGE in CHIEF, a Peerless Judge; a Judge, who by Order or Degree, (no matter whether) Superior, even in Power, to all other Judges. It is not clearer in History, that ever there was such a Person as St. Cyprian, than it is in the Cyprianic Monuments, that every Bishop, within his own Diocese, enjoyed this Prerogative. It were easy to fill some Sheets with plain Evidences for it, but I shall content my self with a few plain Testimonies. Particularly, let G. R. turn to Ep. 66th. (it is 69th to Pamelius) and there he may have enough for his Conviction. Florentius Pupianus had Charged St Cyprian with divers Crimes, and among the rest, the Odious Sin of Pride: Hear now what he returns to this Charge. Which of us Two (says he) is farthest from Humility? Whether I who daily serve the Brethren, and readily, and chearfully and joyfully, receive those who come to the Church, or thou who Constitutest thy self a BISHOP of a BISHOP, and a JUDGE of him whom God hath given to be JUDGE for the time? (p) And a little after, From hence have Heresies and Schisms hitherto sprung, and do daily spring, that the BISHOP who is ONE, and is OVER the Church, is contemned by the proud presumption of some, and the Man whom God has been pleased to Honour, is judged unworthy by Men. (q) Hear likewise what he says to Cornelius, Ep. 59. (Pamelio 55.) This and this alone is the source of all Heresies and Schisms, that God's PRIEST (the Bishop) is not Obeyed, and Men do not consider that at the same time, there ought to be only ONE PRIEST, (or Bishop) only ONE JUDGE, in CHRIST's STEAD, in a Church. (r)

(p) Quis autem nostrum longè est ab Humilitate? Utrumne ego qui quotidie fratibus servio, & venientes ad Ecclesiam singulos, benignè & cum voto & gaudio suscipio? autio qui te EPISCOPUM

EPISCOPI & JUDICEM JUDICIS ad tempus à Deo Dati constituis? Ep. 66. p. 166.

THESE

(q) Inde enim Schismata & Hærefes Obortæ sunt & Oriuntur dum EPISCOPUS qui UNUS est & Ecclesiæ PRÆEST superba quorundam præsumptione Contemnitur, & Homo Dignatione Dei Honoratus indignus ab hominibus judicatur. *ibid.* p. 167.

(r) Neq; enim ALIUNDE Hærefes Obortæ sunt aut Nata sunt Schismata quam inde quod SACERDOTI DEI non OBTEMPERATUR, nec UNUS in Ecclesia ad tempus, SACERDOS, & ad tempus JUDEX VICE CHRISTI cogitatur. *Ep.* 59. p. 129.

§ XLII. THESE two last Testimonies I adduced in the *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, to prove, that by those *Principles*, the Bishop was so much the *Center*, or *Principle of Unity*, that the Contempt of him, and Undutifulness to him, were reckoned the true Fountains of Heresies and Schisms. (s) And G. R. was so wise as to pass them intirely over, without so much as once offering to reconcile them with the Principles of Presbytery. (t) May it not be as much his Wisdom to vex them as little, now they are brought to prove that a Bishop, in St. Cyprian's Time, was a *Peerless Judge*, Cloath'd with a *Peerless Power* within his own *District*? And how frequently doth our Martyr reason from the *Powers and Prerogatives* of the ONE JUDGE, the *High-Priest*, among the *Jews*, to the like *Powers and Prerogatives* of the *One Judge*, the *Bishop*, among *Christians*? Take for a Taste the Testimonies on the Margent. (u) In short,

(s) p. 23.

(t) §. 30. p. 38, 39.

(u) Nec putent sibi vitæ

aut salutis constare rationem, si EPISCOPIS & SACERDOTIBUS obtemperare Noluerint cum in Deuteronomio Dominus dicat, & Homo quicumq; fecerit in Superbia, ut non exaudiat SACERDOTEM & JUDICEM quicumq; fuerit, in diebus illis, morietur homo ille, &c. *Ep.* 4. p. 9.

Vide paria, Ep. 43. p. 85. imo passim, præsertim, *Ep.* 59. p. 128. ubi sic, noster: Quomodo possunt Censuram Domini Ultoris evadere qui talia ingerunt non solum Fratribus sed & Sacerdotibus (i. e. Episcopis) quibus Honor tantus de Dei Dignatione Conceditur, ut quisquis SACERDOTI ejus, & ad tempus hic JUDICANTI non obtemperaret, statim Necaretur, &c.

§ XLIII. LET any Man but read over, and consider only one of our Martyrs Epistles, and let him consider the main design and purpose of it, and then let him say, if he can, that by the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*, the Bishop was not a *Peerless Judge* within his own *Diocefs*. It is that very long, and very excellent 59th *Epistle*. An Epistle, which if G. R. had read seriously, and considered narrowly, I am apt to think he had never been so rash as to have published such a Book as his *Cyprianic Bishop Examined*; I do most heartily recommend the reading of it to all those who can, and have opportunity. For the Instruction of others, let me only give this brief account of it: St. Cyprian had not long been a Christian,

Christian, and he had been shorter time a Clergy-man, when he was advanced to the *Episcopal Chair* of *Carthage*; there was a Party therefore at *Carthage*, which was highly discontented at his Promotion; of this Party, besides *Felicissimus* a Deacon, and perhaps divers others of the Inferiour Orders, there were *Five Presbyters*: And so far as we can learn, by such Records as are Extant, all the *Presbyters* of *Carthage* were but Eight in number. So that those Five made the *Major* part of the *Presbytery*, and by consequence, by the *Presbyterian Principles*, might have fairly and legally carried any thing they had a mind for, by *plurality* of *Voices*, against the other three, and *St. Cyprian* too, supposing him to have had no other *Powers* than such as may be challenged by a *Presbyterian Moderator*. But this by the way. This Party thus Headed by Five *Presbyters*, at last, upon some occasion which they thought seasonable, make a formal Schism, and chuse *Fortunatus*, one of the *Five*, and get him Ordained their Bishop, by *Five*, who had sometime been *Bishops*, but for divers Crimes had been justly and canonically *Deposed*, before they *Imposed Hands* on *Fortunatus*. The Schismatics having thus Cast themselves into the *Form* of a Church, (which could not be without a Bishop) their next Care is to try if they can get other Bishops to own them as a True Part of the Church Catholick, and allow them their Communion. Particularly, they Address to *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, an Eminent Bishop of an Eminent Church, whose Example (could they gain him to own them) would be of great Advantage to them, by its Influence on other Bishops. And to engage him the more effectually, they offer to him to make him *Judge* of the Controversies between *them* and *St. Cyprian*. *St. Cyprian* gets from *Cornelius* a full Account of this their Plot and Negotiation; whereupon he writes this 59th *Epistle* to *Cornelius*, in which he puts him in Mind, that if he will continue to Act as becomes a Brother Bishop, a worthy Member of the *Episcopal College*, he must not listen to their Suggestions; he must not hearken to their Proposal of making him *Judge* of their Cause. They had been already Judged by himself, whose Subjects they were, and his Sentence had been Ratified by all the Bishops of *Africa*, and ought to be Ratified by all Bishops, all the World over, according to the Custom of the Ecclesiastical Discipline, and the Necessary Laws of Catholick Communion.

O o

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

nion. Many of their Party had already forsaken them; more would, if he, (*Cornelius*) according to his Duty, should Discourage them. It was his Part, therefore, to send them back to himself (*Cyprian*) against whom they had Rebelled, and who was properly their *Judge*: If they should return sincere Penitents, he had an Heart to Pardon them, and Absolve them from the Sentence of Excommunication he had justly pronounced against them: But till they first submitted to him, and made their peace with him, no other Bishop could lawfully allow them his Communion. This is, in short, the great purpose of the *Epistle*. And in the prosecution of this main Design, he has interspersed almost in every Reasoning, bright Evidences of his own being *Judge* of all Persons within his own District. But for brevity, I shall only Translate and Transcribe one part of the *Epistle*. It is p. 137, 138, 139. where, having told *Cornelius* how many were every day deserting the *Schismatics*, after they had Chosen an *Antibishop*, he discourses to this purpose:

XLIV.

MANY return daily, and knock at the Church, (i. e. are earnest to be restored to her Communion) but in the mean time, I, who must render an Account to our Lord, do seriously ponder, and carefully examine who are worthy to be received, and admitted to the Church; for some are so unworthy by their own Crimes, or their Admission is so resolutely and eagerly resisted by their Brethren, that they cannot be received without the scandal and manifest danger of many. And (as you know) Prudence does not allow that we should so collect Parts that are rotten, as to endanger those which are sound and wholesome, neither is he an useful or a wise Pastor, who so mixes the scabbed and infected Sheep with the Flock, as to corrupt the whole Flock by the Contagion of the Malady. O that you could be present with me, Dearest Brother, when those wicked and perverse People return from the Schism! Then would you see what difficulty I have to perswade the Brethren to so much patience, as without reluctancy to consent to their reception; for, as they rejoyce, and are glad when those who are tolerable, and not extreamly vicious, do return, so they rage and exclaim when those who are incorrigible and froward, when those who have polluted themselves, either with Adulteries, or Idolatrous Sacrifices, and yet continue proud, do return to the Church to corrupt the good Souls, which have always continued

in

in her Communion. With extream difficulty it is that I persuade the People, or rather extort from them, to allow such to be admitted. And I must confess, there is the greater reason for this the People's reluctancy, in as much as divers, whom my gentleness made me to admit, while the People resisted and contradicted, have turn'd worse than they were before, &c

(v) Can any thing be plainer than it is here, that St. Cyprian, as Bishop of Carthage, was the Person who had Authority to judge of the Qualifications and Dispositions of those who offered to be reconciled to the Church, and the Power to reconcile them? But this is not all, hear him farther concerning *Felicissimus*, and the rest of the Legates, who had been sent by the Schismatics to *Cornelius*. He tells *Cornelius*, that their Consciences would not allow them to come to him, (*Cyprian*) and supplicate for a Reconciliation with the Church, and that was the reason that made them cross the Sea to importune him (*Cornelius*): They have not the Impudence to come to me, (says he) nor the Confidence to stand before me, because they know what bitter and grievous Crimes can be Charged upon them by the Brethren: Let them come if they dare, and be judged by me. The only Excuse, the only Defence they can make for themselves, is, to shew their sense of their Sins, and the fruits of their Repentance. Let them come, the Church is shut to no Man, the BISHOP denies himself to no Man. My Patience, my Gentleness, and my Humanity, are in readiness to all who come. I wish all may return to the Church. I wish all my Fellow Soldiers may be combined in the Camp of Christ, and in the House of God the Fa-

(v) Namq; ii quibus in præteritum præstigiæ obtinebantur, & dabantur verba fallacia, quod simul in Ecclesiam regressuri dicerentur, postea quam viderunt illic Pseudo-episcopum factum, frustratos & deceptos se esse didicerunt & remeant quotidie atq; ad Ecclesiam pulsant; nobis tamen à quibus ratio reddenda est, anxie ponderantibus & sollicitè examinantibus qui recipi

& admitti ad Ecclesiam debeant. Quibusdam enim ita aut Crimina sua obstant, aut Fratres Obstinatè & firmiter renituntur, ut recipi omnino non possint cum (vel nisi cum) Scandalo & periculo plurimorum. Neque enim sic Putamina (quidam legunt Putramina) quædam Colligenda sunt, ut quæ integra & sana sunt vulnerentur: Nec Utilis & Consultus est PASTOR qui ita morbidas & Contactas OVES GREGI admiscet, ut GREGEM totum mali Cohærentis afflictatione Contaminet.

O si posses F. C. istis interesse Nobiscum cum Pravi isti & Perversi de Schismate revertuntur! Videres quis mihi labor sit persuadere Patientiam fratribus Nostriis, ut animi dolore Sopito recipiendis malis, curandisq; Consentiant. Namq; ut Gaudet & Latantur cum tolerabiles & minus Culpabiles redeunt: ita contra Fremunt & Reluctantur quoties inemendabiles & protervi, & vel Adulteriis vel Sacrificiis Contaminati, & posthac adhuc insuper & Superbi, sic ad Ecclesiam remeant, ut bona intus ingenia corrumpant. Vix plebi Persuadeo, imo Extorqueo ut tales patiantur admitti: & justior factus est fraternitatis Dolor, ex eo quod unus atq; alius, OBNITENTE PLEBE & CONTRADICENTE, MEA tamen FACILITATE SUSCEPTI, peiores extiterunt, quam prius fuerant.—Ep. 59. p. 137.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

ther : I can Pardon all Crimes : I dissemble many, through the earnest desire I have of collecting the Fraternity. Nay, even those Crimes which are committed against God, I do not examine with the rigideſt ſeverity. I am almoſt faulty my ſelf, in remitting faults ſo eaſily. I receive all ſincere Penitents, all who do humbly confeſs their ſins, and make ſatisfaction, with all readineſs and fulneſs of Affection. But if there are any who think they can return to the Church, not by ſupplications, but by threatnings, or fancy, that they can make way for themſelves, not by Lamentations and Satisfaction, but by Terrors, let them aſſure themſelves, that they ſhall find the Church of our Lord ſhut up againſt them : And that the Invincible Camp of Chriſt, being fortified by our Lord's Protection, ſhall yield to no Menaces. A Priest of God, (or a Biſhop) adhering to the Goſpel, and obſerving Chriſt's Precepts, may be killed, but not conquered.—What ? Brother, ſhall we ſo far prostitute the Dignity of the Catholick Church ? And the Faithful and Uncorrupted Maſteſty of the People who retain their Integrity ? And the SACERDOTAL (i.e. the Episcopal) AUTHORITY and POWER, as to ſuffer thoſe who are OUT of the Church, to Judge the RULER of the Church ? Or Hereticks to Judge a Chriſtian ? Or the Sickly, the Sound ? Or the wounded, him that is whole ? Or Lapsers, him that hath ſtood ? Or Criminals, their JUDGE ? Or ſhall we allow thoſe who are Sacrilegious, to Judge THE PRIEST ? What remains, but that the Church ſhould veil to the Capitol ? (w)

(w) De iſtis vero quid dicam qui nunc ad TE (Cornelium Romanum) cum Feliciffimo — navigarunt, legati à Fortuna to PSEUDOEPISCOPO MISSI—Conſcientiam ſuam norunt, nec NOS (me nempe Cyprianum) audent adire.—Neq; enim illis Frons poteſt eſſe ad NOS accedendi, aut apud NOS conſiſtendi, cum ſint acerbiffima & graviffima Crimina quæ eis à fratribus ingerantur. Si JUDICIUM NOSTRUM (i. e. meum Cypriani, ut ex iis quæ ſequuntur Maniſeſtiſſimum) voluerint experiri, veniant. Deniq; ſi qua illis Excusatio & Defenſio poteſt eſſe, videamus quem habeant Satisfactionis ſuæ ſenſum, quem afferant Penitentiaæ fructum : Nec Eccleſia iſtic cuiquam clauditur, nec EPISCOPUS alicui denegatur : Patientia & Facilitas & Humanitas noſtra venientibus præſto eſt. Opto omnes in Eccleſiam regredi, Opto univerſos Commilitones noſtros intra Chriſti Caſtra, & Dei Patris domicilia concludi. REMITTO omnia, multa DISSIMULO ſtudio & voto colligendæ fraternitatis : etiam quæ in Deum Commiſſa ſunt, non PLENO JUDICIO Religionis EXAMINO : Delictis pluſquam oportet REMITTENDIS, pere IPSE DELINQUO : AMPLECTOR prompta & plena dilectione cum Penitentia revertentes, peccatum ſuum ſatisfactione Humili & Simplici Conſistentes. Si qui autem ſunt qui putant ſe ad Eccleſiam non precibus ſed minis regredi poſſe ; aut exiſtimant aditum ſe ſibi non Lamentationibus & Satisfactionibus, ſed Terroribus facere ; pro certo habeant contra tales clauſam ſtare Eccleſiam Domini ; nec Caſtra Chriſti invicta & fortia, & Domino tuente Munita, minis cedere. SACERDOS DEI Evangelium tenens, & Chriſti Præcepta Cuſtodiens,

occidi potest, non potest vinci.—An ad hoc *F. C.* Deponenda est Catholica Ecclesiæ Dignitas & Plebis intus positæ fidelis atq; incorrupta Majestas & SACERDOTALIS quoq; AUCTORITAS & POTESTAS ut judicare velle se dicant de Ecclesiæ PRÆPOSITO, extra Ecclesiam Constituti? De Christiano Hæretici? de Sano Saucii? de integro vulnerati? de stante Lapsi? de JUDICE Rei? de SACERDOTE Sacrilegi? (i. e. *Uno verbo*, Felicissimus sive Fortunatus eorumve satellites, qui contra me Rebellaverunt, de me Episcopo suo, &c.) Quid superest quam ut Ecclesia Capitolio Cedat, &c. *Ep.* 59. p. 138, 139.

I DO not lay the stress on my Translation, (tho' I think § XLV. I have not receded from St. Cyprian's mind) but on our Martyr's own words, as you have them faithfully Transcribed on the Margent. Let any Man thoroughly consider them, and reconcile them with the *Idea* of a *Presbyterian Moderator*, if he can. Or rather, was it possible for St. Cyprian, had he set himself for it, to have painted a JUDGE (at least) in CHIEF, in more lively colours, than he has here done himself, as being such a JUDGE within his own District? To attempt to add more Light to such a Genuine Piece, might readily obscure it, and marr its Beauty, or disorder its Symmetry, and therefore I shall let it alone, and proceed.

XII. THEN, if we may Reason by fair consequences, by § XLVI. the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*, a Bishop was the same to his *Diocefs*, that a King is to his *Kingdom*. St. Cyprian Reasons more than once to this purpose, against Schismatics. He makes them Rebels to their Bishop; and he makes Antibishops, Usurpers; and he makes True Bishops immediately subordinate to God, and only Accountable to him. From such Principles as these, it needed be no difficult task to draw the Consequence handsomly enough: But his Reasonings, which I take notice of at present, are such as these, in which he makes the Sin of Schismatical Bishops, such as *Novatianus*, *Fortunatus*, &c. of the same Stamp with *Hieroboam's*, in turning King over the *Ten Tribes*. (x) And in (x) Deniq; another place, he proves that they cannot be Bishops by *Divine Approbation*, from *Hof.* 8. 4. *They have set up Kings,* quam sit inseparabile Unitatis Sacramentum &

quam sine spe sint, & Perditionem sibi Maximam de indignatione Dei acquirant, qui Schisma faciunt, & RELICTO EPISCOPO alium sibi FORIS PSEUDOEPISCOPUM constituunt, declarat—Scriptura divina, ubi à Tribu Judæ Decem Tribus scissæ sunt, & RELICTO REGE alterum sibi FORIS constituerunt. Et indignatus est, inquit, Dominus in omne Semen Israel — quia constituerunt sibi REGEM Hieroboam.—Indignatum esse Dominum dicit— quod ab Unitate dissipati essent, atq; ALTERUM sibi REGEM constituissent, &c. *Ep.* 69. p. 183, 184.

but

(y) Plane EPISCOPI non de voluntate Dei fiunt, qui extra Ecclesiam fiunt: Si cut ipse Dominus in 12 Prophetis po-

but not by me. (y) Nay, we have more than thirty Bishops besides him, insinuating on the same Argument, in a *Synodical Epistle*. (z) And here, let me digress a little, if that which is in some sort necessary, for vindicating my former Book from an imagined Absurdity, may be called a Digression. The Matter is this:

nit & dicit, sibi metipsis REGEM constituerunt & non per me. Ep. 59. p. 129.

(z) Ordinari nonnunquam indignos, non secundum Dei voluntatem, sed secundum humanam Prasumptionem, & hac Deo displicere quæ non veniunt ex legitima & iusta Ordinatione, Deus ipse Manifestat per Osee Prophetam dicens, sibi met ipsis constituerunt Regem & non per me. Ep. 67. p. 172.

§ XLVII.

(a) p. 43.

AFTER I had proved by Arguments, which G. R. shall never be able to Answer, that a Bishop, in St. Cyprian's Time, had the Sole Power of Ordinations, I added, (a) *That by the Fundamental Rules of Society, it belonged to the Supreme Power, wherever lodged, to Promote and give Commissions to all Inferiour Officers; affirming, that this was one of the Rights of Majesty, and one as Intrinsick and Incommunicable as any.* For this my Adversary has insulted me more than once. Thus, reckoning up the Stars, (as he calls them) with which my *Treatise* is bespangled, he makes this one (one, no doubt, of the first Magnitude) that I ascribe MAJESTY to my Bishop.

(b) § 4. p. 3.

(b) And because I had said, on some occasion, that St. Cyprian wrote in an *Authoritative Stile* to his Clergy, using the word SCIATIS, a word whereby Superiours used to signify their Will and Pleasure to their Subjects, G. R. Chastizes me to purpose. He think it not enough to say, that many more will smile at my fancy (of making SCIATIS a word importing Authority) than will be convinced by the strength of my Reason drawn from it, (c) (tho' I perceive now the Fancy, if it be a Fancy, is the Admirable Mr. Dodwell's (d) as well as mine) but he adds, *That it is a Token of a Mind deeply impressed with the MAJESTY of a Bishop, when the word doth so sound in mine Ears.* Now,

(c) § 44. p. 60.

(d) De Jure Laicorum Sacerdotali, cap. 2. § 29.

§ XLVIII.

IN the first place, it is certain that I did not, in direct Terms, ascribe MAJESTY to my Bishop, and it must be by Collection only, that G. R. can fasten it upon me: But if it can be collected by good consequence, or consequences, that by ascribing to my Bishop, the Power of Granting Commissions to Inferiour Officers, I ascribed MAJESTY to him, I would gladly learn of G. R. if they are not as good consequences, whereby

whereby I have just now inferred, that St. Cyprian, and his Contemporaries, look'd on a Bishop as a KING within his own *Diocefs*? And if *They*, without any Absurdity, could make a *Bishop* a *King*, why might not I, while Reasoning on their Principles, ascribe MAJESTY to him, with as little Absurdity? Can G. R. form to himself the *Idea* of a KING without MAJESTY? Is he for Casting even Kings themselves, in the same *Mould* with *Presbyterian Moderators*? But this is not all; for,

2. SUPPOSE G. R. did justly collect, that I ascribed § XLIX. MAJESTY to a Bishop, (nor do I say, it is an infirm Collection) and suppose I had not had those Reasonings of St. Cyprian, and his Contemporaries, to found on, yet, how will G. R. prove it Absurd to ascribe MAJESTY to a Bishop? Can he give us a *Just Definition* of MAJESTY, *Politically* taken, and withal, prove that it cannot agree to a *Bishop*, within his own *Diocefs*? What Man, of any good Acquaintance with any Author, (*Bodinus*, e.g. or *Arniseus*) who have written skilfully in *Politicks*, will not readily acknowledge that MAJESTY may be properly attributed to any Person in whom the *Sovereignty* of any *Body Politick* is lodged? By consequence, if I have proved, or can prove, that, by the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*, the *Ecclesiastical Sovereignty* was Lodged in the Bishop, where is the Absurdity of ascribing MAJESTY to him? The Term SOVEREIGNTY cannot (I hope) offend G. R's, or any other *Scottish Presbyterian's Ears*, when they remember that no meaner Men than Mr. *Samuel Rutherford*, and Mr. *Andrew Melvin*, have used it, and applied it even to *Church-men*: *Rutherford*, if I do right remember, somewhere, in his *Peaceable Plea for Paul's Presbytery*. Sure I am, *Melvin* calls every Minister SUPREME ECCLESIASTICAL MAGISTRATE within his own Parish. (e) With the Reader's allowance, let me farther ask,

(e) Quod autem asseris
(Tilene) Ne-

minem Apostolorum cæteris præfuisse; verè: Et nos similiter neminem usquam Episcopum, ex Scriptura, Episcopo, Contendimus. Sed quemq; in sua Paræcia SUPREMUM esse ECCLESIASTICUM MAGISTRATUM asserimus. Contra *Tilenum*. Cap. 2. § 13.

3. WHY may not MAJESTY be ascribed to a *Christian Bishop*, as well as *Hirtius* ascribes it to the *Priest* of *Bellona* § L.
in

(f) Venit Comana, vetustissimum, in Cappadocia, Belionæ templum, quod tanta Religione Colitur ut Sacerdos ejus Deæ, MAJESTATE, imperio & potentia fecundus à Rege, Consensu Gentis illius habeatur. *Hirt. de Bel. Alex. p. 742. Edit. 1661.* (g) Ille (Diabolus) dudum Angelica MAJESTATE Suffultus & : De Zelo & Livore, p. 222.

(h) Neq; enim ad Catholicæ Ecclesiæ MAJESTATEM pariter ac Dignitatem pertinere debet quod apud se Hæreticorum & Schismaticorum molitur Audacia—Ep. 59. p. 132.

(i) Vide Supra, § XLIV. (m)

(k) Quam vanum est, F. C. ut Novatio nuper Retuso & Refutato & per totum Orbem, à SACERDOTIBUS DEI Abstento, nunc Adulatores adhuc patiamur Nobis illudere, & de MAJESTATE & Dignitate Ecclesiæ judicare? Ep. 68. p. 177.

§ LI.

(l) Inst. Lib. 4. C. 4. § 2.
(m) Quam (n) Matinam cum Operibus Munitionibusq; sepsisset (Antonius) nec cum florantissima Colonia dignitas, neque

4. IF what hath been said is not enough, then, I do farther ask, Doth not Mr. Calvin himself (l) ascribe a Consular Power to the Primitive Bishops? And doth not Cicero ascribe MAJESTY even to a Consul Designatus, to one who was only to be promoted to that Dignity at the next Election? (m) And why might not I, as well as Salmasius, ascribe MAJESTY to a Bishop? (n) Was it Orthodox in him enough, and must it be Heretical in me? Nay, what material difference between what I said, and what Mr. Blondel himself hath said,

CONSULIS DESIGNATI MAJESTAS à Parricidio deterreret, &c. Phil. 13. n. 358.

(n) Quid aliud hic vester (Petavius) O Episcopi nunc facit? Sed quod longe magis facit ad imminuendam, imo prorsum pessumdandam Vestri Ordinis MAJESTATEM, ab ambitione, Honorum Cupiditate, Ceterisq; malis artibus, quibus depravati sunt Christianorum animi, Originem id traxisse dicit. Walo Mess. p. 165, 166, & Paulo post, à malis vero artibus, & Corruptione animorum, & totius Ecclesiæ depravatione, vitiorumq; in locum virtutum Christianarum subrogatione, initium ejus (præminentia Episcopalis) & institutum arcessere, hoc vero non ferendum Episcopis si MAJESTATIS suæ Comiter ab omnibus Conservandæ curam agere velint. ib.

in his *Apology* for St. *Jerom*? (o) To add no more at present, what if the great *Chamier* Reasons not only to the same purpose, but even in the same Terms that I did? Has not he this for one Argument against the *Pope's Ecclesiastical Monarchy*, that supposing such a *Monarchy* it would follow, against the constant practice of the *Primitive Church*, that all *Bishops* should be *Created* by him who is the *Monarch*? The consequence, says he, is manifest, *For in every Republick, all the Magistrates are in Use to be Created by him in whom the MAJESTY is Lodged.* (p) Let G. R. try his hand, and shew so much as a shadow of a Difference between *Chamier's* Reasoning and *mine*. By this time, methinks, G. R. and his Brethren may see, that it will not be meer Trifling about Terms, or making a Pother about Words or Phrases, that will be able to overthrow the Credit of my former Book. To shew them this, was all I design'd this Digression for; and so I leave it.

(o) Ut ei quæ olim, in Romana Republica, exercitus elegerat, levaverat, Principem Salutaverat, nihil ad Summam Imperii potestatem, MAJESTATEM-QUE deesse Credebatur; (ita) in quem Presbyterium latis Suffragiis Consenserat, quem in excelsiori gradu Collocaverat, & Episcopum

Nominaverat, PLENO (hoc ipso) EPISCOPATUS JURE gavissimum fuisse. *Blond. Apol. pro Sent. Hieronym. p. 310.*

(p) — Consequentia patet, quia in Republica qualibet, omnes Magistratus Creari Solent ab eo penes quem est MAJESTAS. *Panstrat. T. 2. L. 13. C. 10. § 1.*

EVERY Ingenuous Reader, by this time, (I am apt to think) will readily acknowledge, that I have competently perform'd what I undertook for, in this Chapter, viz. That I have given such a *Specimen* of *Prerogatives* lodg'd in the Persons of the *Bishops* of the *Cyprianic Age*, as contradistinguished from *Presbyters*, as may be sufficient to justify the *Propriety* of the *Terms* and *Phrases* accounted for in the preceding Chapter; and withal, farther Demonstrate that *Bishops*, then, had *more Power* as well as *more Dignity* than *Presbyters*. It were easy to adduce a great many more of such *Prerogatives*, neither mentioned here nor in my former Book. An accurate Enquirer may readily collect them. I might likewise Resume all those I did formerly insist on, and not only easily Vindicate them, every one of them, from the always frivolous, and frequently ridiculous Exceptions offered against them by G. R. but farther Confirm them, by many other proper and concluding Arguments. But I am unwilling, where it is so very needless, to presume too much upon my Reader's Patience. I shall only therefore Review one of them (and by my Management of it, the Reader may

competently Judge what might be said for the rest.) It shall be,

§ LIII.

XIII. THE Bishop's *Sovereign Power* in the *Administration* of the *Sacraments*. G. R. seems to have confessed, that if the Bishops were Vested with this *Prerogative*, it will follow by good consequence that they had a *Sovereign Interest* in *Excommunication*, *Absolution*, *Injoyning Penances*, &c. He says expressly, *He will not Contest the Consequence with me*: All he pretends is, That I did not sufficiently establish the Antecedent. (q) This then is a *Prerogative* of very great consequence: A *Prerogative*, which if I can sufficiently Establish, I have Reason to hope that G. R. will be brought to Confess, That a Bishop in St. Cyprian's Time had *more Power* than *Presbyters*. Let us try then, if it can be sufficiently Established; particularly, let us insist a little on the *Sacrament* of *Baptism*, for it is plain that the Bishop's *Prerogative*, as to this, being once sufficiently Established, the *other Sacrament* will follow in consequence. I shall move by these two steps: *First*, I shall vindicate the Arguments I did formerly adduce; and, *Secondly*, I shall offer some other Arguments for the Bishop's *Sovereign Power* of *Baptism*.

§ LIV.

FIRST, I shall vindicate the Arguments I did formerly adduce. This needs neither be a difficult nor a tedious Task. For when I was collecting *The Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*, thinking it improper to be Prolix on any point commonly agreed to by Learned Presbyterians, I insisted only on one Testimony of St. Cyprian's, which, together with *Firmitian's* and *Fortunatus's* Bishop of *Thuchabori*, two of his Contemporaries, and *Tertullian's* and *Ignatius's* two of his Ancestors, seem'd to me sufficient for my purpose. These five Testimonies appear'd to me so very plain and peremptory, that I do confess I thought them impregnable, yet G. R. has endeavoured to disable them. What he has answered to *Tertullian's* Testimony, has been already considered in part, (r) and we may hereafter have occasion to hear more about it. (s) And thither I refer the Reader at present.

§ LV.

To *Ignatius's*, which is, *That it is not Lawful to Baptize without the Bishop*, he has return'd a most surprizing Answer. He says, the Meaning is, *It is not Lawful to Baptize without the Authority of the Presbytery, which the Bishop as their Pre- ses conveyeth*. (t) What should be said to such a Banter? For my part, I think, he that laughs at it, treats it according

(r) Supra,
§ XXXIV.

(s) Infra, cap.
VIII.

(t) § XLIX.
P. 73.

to its Merit. Why should one be at pains to ask G. R. if he thinks it Creditable thus to obtrude his own wild and groundless Fancies on his Readers? Or, to put him to it, to produce so much as one Testimony from any one Author of the First Three Centuries, that can give the least appearance of Countenance to his Gloss on the words of *Ignatius*? What need of Reasoning the Case with him, I say, with any degree of seriousness? Yet let me tell him one thing seriously: It is, that seeing he is so lucky at Reconciling the Epistles of *Ignatius* with the Principles of *Presbytery*, (and even the Testimony we have before us, than which there is none in all those Epistles, more apparently irreconcilable with those Principles) I cannot understand for what Reason he should question the Genuineness of those Epistles, as he has done. This is certain, The greatest Reason that moved *Salmasius*, *Blondel*, and *Daille*, to question it, was that, in those Epistles, the Episcopal preheminance was so keenly and so frequently asserted. *Salmasius* says, *The Author of those Epistles repeats and inculcates this preheminance, Usq; ad Nauseam, even to the turning the Reader's stomach.* (u) And therefore he will needs have them forged about the beginning or the middle of the Second Century; at which time, he says, *Bishops were set over Presbyters.* *Blondel* affirms peremptorily, that *the Author of those Epistles has been Anxious for a Prelacy, so Anxious, that he has in a manner reckoned that there was an end of Christianity, if there were not Bishops above Presbyters, and if Presbyters did not pay a due Homage and Obedience to Bishops.* (v) It is *Daille's* [*Palmarium Argumentum*] his Thumping, his Victorious, his All conquering Argument, that *the Author of those Epistles always distinguishes Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons; that is, Three Orders of Clergy-men,* (w) which, he says, *cannot agree with the Time of Ignatius.*

(u) Epistolæ illæ natæ & SUPPOSITÆ videntur circa initium aut Medium Secundi Seculi, quo tempore PRIMUSSINGULARIS EPISCOPATUS SUPRAPRESBYTERATUM introductus fuit: Ideo ut eum Commendaret

& Confirmaret, in omnibus Epistolis septem prioribus USQUE AD NAUSEAM saepe ITERAT & INCULCAT EPISCOPO tanquam Christo esse OBEDIENDUM. NIHIL SINE EPISCOPO in Ecclesia agendum, &c. *Wal. Mess.* p. 253.

(v) Ad quid vero ANXIUS ille per omnes fere Epistolas pro EPISCOPATU SINGULARI LABOR, quasi de Christianismo actum sit si EPISCOPI Presbyteris MAJORES Christianis plebibus desint, aut ab iisdem minus colantur? &c. *Blond. Præf. ad Apol. pro sent. Hieron.* p. 42.

(w) Vide *Dallaum de Scriptis quæ Nomine Ignatii Antiocheni Circumferuntur.* Cap. 26. p. 386. Edit. Geneva 1666. Hic (quisquis Epistolarum harum Author fuit) duo illa Nomina (Episcopi nempe & Presbyteri) plane eodem sensu accipit quo à tertii seculi & sequentium Christianis, ad hæc usq; Tempora accepta fuisse Scimus & libenter Concedimus: Sic Nimirum ut

duas Dignitates à seinvicem distinctas significant; Episcopusq; is intelligatur qui Presbyter quidem ipse quoq; est, sed & Presbyterio Præest, & in eorum Collegio Caput est, Presbyter vero is fit qui EPISCOPO SUBEST: Unde Necessario Exurgunt Tres in Ecclesia Ministrorum ORDINES: Episcopus PRIMUS & SUMMUS, Presbyter SECUNDUS & MEDIUS, Diaconus deniq; TERTIUS & INFIMUS. *Hæc ille.*

(x) Mr. Jamison in his *Nazianzenian Questions. Part. II. Sect. IV. p. 134, &c.*

(y) Cyp. Bishop. Examined, § 36. p. 47.

In short, had it not been for the frequent, the plain, the peremptory, the irresistible Evidences for Episcopal Superiority, contain'd in those Epistles, (whereof this Sovereign Power of the Sacraments is certainly none of the meanest) I make no manner of doubt but these three great Advocates for Presbytery, would have allowed *Ignatius* to have continued in as peaceable possession of his own Genuine Epistles, as *Clemens Romanus* and *Polycarpus* are allowed to do of theirs; yet so blind were they, as not to see what not only G. R. but even Mr. Jamison, (x) who confesses he wants the use of his Eyes, have seen, it seems, very distinctly, namely, That every Syllable in all those Epistles is Reconcilable with the Presbyterian Principles. But to let alone Mr. Jamison at present, and keep me by my *Man*, G. R. let me ask him seriously, Can he believe himself in the Right, in thus Reconciling *Ignatius* and *Parity*, when such three Men (as much concerned, in Interest, as he) deem'd it impossible? And now let the Reader Judge, what is to be thought of G. R's Abilities. He has not only here made *Ignatius* speak plain Presbyterianism, with regard to the Sacrament of Baptism, and in the next §, (viz. § 50. p. 74.) with regard to the Holy Eucharist, but also in another place, (y) he has deliberately, and of set purpose, applied himself to prove *Parity* from the *Ignatian Epistles*. And there too he has made another surprizing Discovery; for he Ingenuously confesses, that what he adduces from them for *Parity*, he has from Famous Archbishop *Usher*, in his *Original of Bishops and Metropolitans*. Now, is it not a surprizing Discovery, that that Excellent Person, so Renown'd for Sense and Learning, should yet have had so little of either, as to adduce Testimonies from *Ignatius's* Epistles for *Episcopal Superiority*, (for it is evident that it is for the Assertion of that, that he adduces them) which very self same Testimonies G. R. the Famous *Vindicator* of the *Scottish Kirk*, can plunder him of, and without Hesitation, Muster amongst his Main Forces, in a pitch'd Battel, for Maintaining Presbyterian Parity? What Feats hereafter can be deem'd too hard for such a Champion? But enough of this,

this, for perhaps I have made too bold with good Manners, in Entertaining the Reader with Accounts of such impudent Extravagancies. Proceed we therefore to vindicate the other three Testimonies, Cyprian's, Firmilian's and Fortunatus's: And here our Luck is good, for,

G. R. has been so very obliging, as to return his Answer to all Three together, as aiming at the same Scope, and founded on the same Principles; so that if his Answer comes not home to every one of them, he has fairly failed in his Reasoning. Now let us try it as to St. Cyprian, the First of the Three. I am for giving G. R. very fair play; wherefore let me first repeat the Testimony, and then I shall consider what he has returned to it. The Testimony is in Ep. 73. written to Jubaianus, where St. Cyprian Reasons to this purpose against the validity of Heretical Baptisms: *'Tis evident where, and by whom the Remission of Sins (which is given in Baptism) can be given: For our Lord gave, first, to Peter (on whom he built his Church, instituting and pointing out thereby, the Original of Unity) that POWER, that whatsoever he should loose in Earth, should be loosed in Heaven: Then, after the Resurrection, he gave it to all the Apostles, when he said, (Joh. 20. 21, 22, 23.) As my Father hath sent me, &c. Whence we learn that none have Authority to Baptize and Remit Sins but the BISHOPS, and those who are founded in the Evangelical Law, and Our Lord's Institution: And that nothing can be Bound or Loosed OUT OF the Church, seeing there is none there who has the Power of Binding and Loosing. Farther, Dearest Brother, (says he) I do not propose this without Divine Warrant; when I say that God has Disposed all things by a certain Law, and a proper Ordinance, and that none can USURP any thing against the BISHOPS, all being Subject to them. For Corah, Dathan and Abiron, attempted to Assume to themselves [LICENTIAM] an Independent Power of Sacrificing, against Moses and Aaron the Priest, and they were singularly punish'd for it, because it was Unlawful. You have our Martyr's own words on the Margent. (2) Now,*

§ LVI.

tem ubi & per quos Remissio peccatorum dari possit, quæ in Baptismo scilicet datur. Nam Petro primum Dominus super quem ædificavit Ecclesiam & unde Unitatis Originem instituit & Ostendit; potestatem istam dedit ut id Solveretur in Cœlis quod ille Solvisset in terris. Et post Resurrectionem quoque ad Apostolos loquitur, dicens, Sicut misit Me Pater & Ego Mitto vos: Hoc cum dixisset, inspiravit, & ait illis: Accipite Spiritum Sanctum: Si cujus remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi: Si cujus tenueritis, tenebuntur. Unde intelligi-

(2) Manifestum est au-

I said

mus non nisi in Ecclesia PRÆPOSITIS, & in Evangelica lege ac Dominica Ordinatione fundatis licere Baptizare, & Remissionem peccatorum dare, foris autem nec ligari aliquid posse nec Solvi, ubi non sit qui aut ligare possit aliquid aut Solvere. Nec hoc F. C. sine Scripturæ divinæ autoritate proponimus, ut dicamus certa lege ac propria Ordinatione divinitus cuncta esse disposita: Nec posse quenkumque contra EPISCOPOS & SACERDOTES Usurpare sibi aliquid quod non sit sui juris & Potestatis. Nam & Core & Dathan & Abyron contra Moysen & Aaron Sacerdotem Sacrificandi sibi LICENTIAM Usurpare Conati sunt: Nec tamen quod illicite ausi sunt impune fecerunt. — Ep. 73 p. 201.

I said (and do still say) that the force of St. Cyprian's Reasoning, here, lies visibly in this, That Baptism perform'd by Hereticks, or Schismatics, could not be valid, because neither perform'd by the Bishop, nor with his Allowance, or in Dependence on him, but in Opposition to him. Let us next consider what G. R. has return'd to this Argument:

§ LVII.

HE says, *It is evident, and that I confess it, that the Question treated by St. Cyprian is, Whether Presbyters, who by Heresy, or Schism, had departed from the Communion of the Church, might Baptize? And if they did, whether that Baptism was Valid, or the Person was to be again Baptized, and that Baptism esteemed Null?* (a) In which Account there

(a) § XLIX.
p. 71, 72.

are at least three palpable Mistakes: 1. That the Question was whether Presbyters, who by Heresy or Schism, &c. For it is most manifest, that St. Cyprian comprehended pretended Bishops as well as Presbyters in the Question: And it has certainly been an oversight in G. R. to say that I confessed that the Question was, Whether Presbyters, &c. 2. Another Mistake, or rather a manifest Blunder, is, that the Question was, Whether such Presbyters, &c. might Baptize; and if they did, whether that Baptism was valid, &c. No such State of the Question, in all the Cyprianic Monuments. This is indeed a State of the Question, which I may safely call, at best, next Neighbour to Nonsense: For if they might Baptize, how could it ever have been a Question, whether their Baptism was valid? For certainly, if they might Baptize, their Baptism was valid Baptism. And therefore the Question had been this upon the Matter, Whether valid Baptism was valid Baptism? A third Mistake is, That St. Cyprian made it part of the Question, Whether the Person was to be AGAIN BAPTIZED? He never allowed any such State of the Question: And he was angry that it should be called RE-BAPTIZATION; that is, *Baptizing again.* (b) But these

(b) Nos autem dicimus

eos qui INDE (i. e. ab hæresi vel Schismate) veniunt non REBAPTIZARI apud Nos, sed are

BAPTIZARI. Ep. 71. p. 193. — Statuentes unum Baptisma esse quod sit Ecclesia Catholica constitutum, ac per hoc non REBAPTIZARI, sed BAPTIZARI à Nobis, &c. Ep. 73. p. 198.

Sine Causa quidam falso & invidioso verbo impugnant veritatem, ut REBAPTIZARE nos dicant: quando Ecclesia Hæreticos non REBAPTIZET sed BAPTIZET. Adelphius à Thasbalte. Conc. Carth. Suff. 35.

are not Matters of the greatest moment; and I have only taken notice of them, that the Reader may see that G. R. can talk crudely as well as other Men. Proceed we now to the pith of his Answer:

NONE of those Fathers (i. e. neither Cyprian, Firmilian, nor Fortunatus, says he) did ever Assert, that in the Church, a Sound Presbyter could not Baptize without the Bishop's leave, within the Limits of his own Charge. (c) Now, if he means (c) p. 71. that none of them, did pronounce so many individual Terms, what is it but Arrant Trifling? If he means that St. Cyprian, e. g. never Asserted so much upon the Matter, what is it but Arrant Forehead? What is it but giving a Sturdy Denial to a Conclusion, without taking any notice of the Premises? Doth not St. Cyprian fairly and formally Reason the Case? Doth he not positively affirm, that no *Sacerdotal Acts* can be performed in Opposition to the Bishops? And doth he not prove it by the punishment of Core, Dathan and Abiron, for their Unhallowed attempt, in assuming to themselves an Independent Power of Sacrificing, a Power of Sacrificing not in Dependence on, but in Opposition to Aaron the Priest? Doth he not most manifestly Reason here, upon the same Principles, on which he Reasoned on all other Occasions, when he made use of the same Medium or Argument? The Medium, I mean, taken from the punishment of those Three Usurpers, Core, Dathan and Abiron? And I am heartily willing that it be Tried in all Cases in which he uses it; and if once in all his Writings he uses it, without Designing thereby to Assert the Bishop's Sovereignty, and to Condemn all Rebellions against him, I shall submit to any Correction G. R. shall contrive for me. But G. R. will prove, that the aforesaid Fathers never meant that a Presbyter could not Baptize without the Bishop's Leave, &c. and he will prove it evidently: How? They plead (forsooth) that none can Baptize out of the Church, nor Bind or Loose out of the Church. Now if G. R. saw any Consequence here, I confess he was sharper sighted than I shall pretend to be. Was there ever pleasanter Reasoning? Consider

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

Consider it Reader ; here it is. St. Cyprian, &c. pleads that none can Baptize out of the Church, nor Bind nor Loose out of the Church, and therefore he never meant that a Sound Presbyter might not Baptize without the Bishop's Leave, within the Limits of his own Charge. Is not this to prove evidently ?

§ LIX. BUT he goes on. They (St. Cyprian, &c.) say expressly, That none can Baptize but they who are founded in the Evangelical Law ; and I hope (says he) it will not be denied that Ministers of Congregations are founded on that Law. No, indeed, it shall not be denied ; but doth it hence follow, that St. Cyprian would have allowed Presbyters to Baptize without the Bishop's Allowance ? Or in Opposition to him ? Were not the Inferiour Orders of Priests and Levites as much founded in the Divine Law as the High Priest himself was ? And will you say that the Inferiour Priests were thereby Impowered to perform Sacerdotal Acts without Dependence on the High Priest ? or in Opposition to him ? In a word, let us first see how St. Cyprian's Arguing from the Rebellion and Punishment of Core, Dathan and Abiron, to infer thereby the great Guilt of attempting to Baptize without Dependence on, or in Opposition to the Bishop, can consist with his allowing Presbyters to Baptize without the Bishop's Leave, within the Limits of their own Charge, and then make of him what you please. But G. R. has not done.

§ LX. THAT Bishops are Named in these Reasonings, as having the Power of Baptizing, maketh nothing against us, Presbyterians. Why ? Because all Parish Ministers were so called, and none without their Allowance ought to intrude on their Charge, in this or any other Administration. (d) Produce but one single Authority from the Writings of St. Cyprian, or any of his Contemporaries, wherein he who was really a Presbyter and no more, was called a Bishop, and the Cause is yours. But the Authority for Baptizing, and other Church-work, was Communicated from the Presbytery, by their President the Bishop : He, indeed, gave the Power, but not by his own sole Authority, but by that of the Presbytery. (e) Our Controversy is about a Matter of Fact at more than 1400 Years distance from us : And might not G. R. have good Reason to laugh at me, if I should be so good Natur'd as to take his own bare Word for a just Determination of it ? And what else have we here, what else can we have here,

(d) p. 72.

(e) p. 72.

bu

but his own bare Word? Do not so far mistake me, Good Sir, as I know you would reject my bare Authority, so allow me to give yours the same Entertainment. I do peremptorily affirm, that you have not so much as the shadow of a Probability of the Truth of your Assertion, in the Monuments of that Age. The *Pope* himself, I trow, doth not pretend that his Infallibility can Answer for Matters of Fact: As little I think my self obliged to believe yours, especially in a Case wherein you not only have Nothing for you, but the whole Stream of the Principles, Reasonings, and Writings of that Age, against you. And so much for shewing G. R's willingness to elude the force of an Unanswerable Argument, found in St. Cyprian's Epistle to *Jubaianus*, for the Bishop's *Sovereign Power in Baptism*.

AS little do his aforesaid Answers evite the Force of the Testimonies of *Fortunatus*, Bishop of *Thuchaboris*, and *Firmilian*. They do indeed continue still to call most loudly for either a Confession of Conviction, or at least a more Passant Solution. They are a little more stubborn than to yield at the very presenting of even the most Formidable Trifle; and therefore I am not asham'd that I adduced them, so far from it, that I shall even repeat them here. *Jesus Christ* (says *Fortunatus* in the Venerable Council of *Carthage*, An. 256.) *Our Lord and God, The Son of God the Father and Creator, built his Church upon a Rock, and not upon Heresy: And he gave the POWER of BAPTIZING to BISHOPS, and not to Hereticks. Those therefore who are out of the Church, and stand against Christ, and scatter his Flock, cannot Baptize, being out of the Church.* (f) He who can elude the Evidence of so plain a Testimony, may do with Testimonies what he pleases.

§ LXI.

(f) *Jesus Christus Dominus & Deus Noster, Dei Patris & Creator*

ris filius super Petram ædificavit Ecclesiam suam, non super Hæresin; & POTESTATEM BAPTIZANDI EPISCOPIS dedit, non Hæreticis. Quare qui extra Ecclesiam sunt, & contra Christum Stantes, oves ejus & Gregem spargunt; Baptizare FORIS non possunt. Con. Carth. Suff. 17.

NEITHER is *Firmilian* less peremptory: No *Hereticks* (says he) *who cut themselves off from the Church of God, can have any POWER or Grace, seeing all POWER and Grace is restricted to the Church where (not every Senior, but) those Seniors Rule who possess the POWER of BAPTIZING, IMPOSING HANDS, (in Confirmation) and ORDAINING.*

§ LXII.

Q q

For,

(g) Sed & Cæ-
teri quique Hæ-
retici, si se ab
Ecclesia scide-
rint nihil ha-
bere POTES-
TATIS aut
Gratiæ pos-
sunt, quando
omnis PO-
TESTAS &
Gratia in Ec-
clesia Consti-
tuta sit, ubi
Præsident
MAJORES
NATI qui &
BAPTIZAN-
DI, & MA-
NUM IMPO-
NENDI &
ORDINAN-
DI POSSI-
DENT PO-
TESTATEM.
Hæretico enim
sicut ORDI-
NARE non li-
cet, nec MA-
NUM IMPONERE,

ita nec BAPTIZARE nec quicquam Sancte ac Spiritualiter Gerere, &c.
Ep. 75. p. 221.

(b) Quale est autem ut cum Paulum post Joannis Baptisma iterato Discipulos suos baptizasse videamus; Nos eos qui ab Hæresi ad Ecclesiam veniunt post inluctam & profanam eorum tinctionem Baptizare dubitemus? Nisi si HIS EPISCOPIIS de quibus nunc, Minor fuit Paulus, ut HI quidem possint per Solam MANUS IMPOSITIONEM venientibus Hæreticis dare Sp. Sanctum: Paulus autem Idoneus non fuerit, qui ab Joanne Baptizatis Spiritum Sanctum per MANUS IMPOSITIONEM daret, nisi eos prius Ecclesiæ baptismo baptizaret.
Ibid. n. p. 221.

(i) Nos etiam illos quos HI qui prius in Ecclesia Catholica EPISCOPI fuerant, & post modum sibi Clericæ Ordinationis potestatem assumptes baptizaverant, pro non Baptizatis habendos judicavimus. *Ibid. p. 227.*

§ LXIII.

SECONDLY, To Confirm this *Episcopal Prerogative* by some other Arguments: And here there are such Stores offering themselves from all Quarters, that one might fill a Volume with them; but I shall study Brevity. And in the first place, if G. R. will be pleased to Advert to it, he may easily find that the Bishops *Sovereign Power of Baptism* follows not only Naturally, but Necessarily from *Most*, if not every

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

291

every One of the *Prerogatives* already accounted for. For Example: Is not *Baptizing* an *Act*, a *principal Act* of the *Sacerdotal Office*? But if it is, what more Congruous, nay, what more Necessary, than that it should be performed in *Dependence* on the *High Priest*? What more Incongruous or Inconsistent, with all the Laws of Order and Government, than that any *Inferiour, Subordinate, Dependent Pastor*, should have a *Priviledge* to *Add* to the *Number*, or *Admit* to the *Immunities* or *Advantages* of the *Flock*, without the *Allowance* of the *Chief Pastor*? If the *Bishop* was the *Judge*, The *One Judge*, The *One Judge* that *Represented Christ*, i. e. at least, if he was the *Chief Judge* in all Matters relating to his own *Distrikt*, what *Equity* or *Reason* can allow that, within this his *Distrikt*, any Person should have the *Prerogative* of *Judging* who was fit to be *Admitted* to the *Liberties*, and *Joyn'd* to the *Society* of those whose *Chief Judge* he was, without *Depeeding* on him? Without *Leave* Obtained from him? Without being *Accountable* to him? What can make it Reasonable or Accountable that *Inferiour Mariners* should *Receive* Passengers into the *Ship* without the *Allowance* of the *Master*? Or that any in the *Family* should admit any Person whatsoever to the *Franchises* of *Sons*, without the *Consent* of the *Father* of the *Family*? Or that *Inferiour Magistrates*, or *Officers*, without the *Sovereign's Allowance*, should *Naturalize* Subjects? How is it possible to Account how *Bishops* should have been *Successors* to the *Apostles*, in the *Supreme Administration* of the *Government* of the *Visible Church*, if such a *Signal Act* of *Government* could have been performed without *Dependence* on them? G. R. himself does not allow his *Imaginary Unfix'd Presbyters* to *Baptize*, nor *Consecrate* the *Eucharist*; yea, nor *Preach* a *Sermon* in any *Presbyterian Parish*, without the *Parish Minister's Allowance*, and I would gladly know if he has better Reasons for it than these I have now mentioned for the *Bishops Sovereign Power* in *Baptism*, according to the *Cyprianic Principles*. And,

THIS way of Reasoning will still appear more Cogent and Concluding, if we consider who they were, who, in those Times, were to be Baptized. They were not only the *Children* of *Christian Parents*; had they been no other, perhaps a *General Canon*, or *Constitution*, appointing all *Infants* descended of *Christian Parents*, under no *Ecclesiastical Censure*, to be Baptized, without any farther Enquiry,

Qq 2

might

§ LXIV.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

might have been sufficient. Such as are Strangers to Ecclesiastical Antiquities, and take their Measures from the Customs of their own Times and Neighbourhood, finding that in Christian Kingdoms, such as these of *Great Britain*, (where it seldom happens that any but Infants are offered to the Holy Laver) *Presbyters* do commonly *Baptize* Infants, in Course, and without a *Special License* from the *Bishop* for every particular Administration of Baptism: Such, I say, at first hearing, perhaps may think it uncouth and surprizing, that Bishops should be Vested with such a *Sovereign Power* of Baptism. Nay, some such Persons (otherwise intelligent, and well inclined to Episcopal Government enough) I myself have had occasion to meet with; but all the Uncouthness, all the Disputableness of this *Prerogative* must forthwith vanish, when it is considered that, in the *Cyprianic Age*, Multitudes of *Adult Persons*, who by their Birth could pretend no Right to Baptism, were, every day, deserting Heathenish Superstition, and humbly supplicating to be received into the Society of Christians. What more frequently mentioned in the Monuments of those Times, than the *Audientes*, the *Catechumeni*, the *Catechizati*, as I remember *Firmilian* calls them? In every Church, at least, in every Church planted in a Populous City, there were particular Masters set apart for the Instruction of such *Catechumeni*; for forming, disposing, preparing them for Baptism. Such were *Pantenus*, *Clemens*, *Origen*, *Dionysius*, &c. in *Alexandria*. Such was *Optatus* at *Carthage*. (l) In short, nothing plainer from our Martyr's Writings, than that there were great Numbers of such Converts. So he tells us in his Excellent Discourse of *Mortality*, (m) and *Ep. 66.* (n) And so much we are told by *Nemesianus*, &c. *Ep. 77.* (o) And who has not heard the famous Story of the Success of *Gregorius Thaumaturgus*, St. *Cyprian's* Contemporary, who when he was made Bishop of *Neocæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, found only XVII Christians, and, when he died, left only XVII Heathens in that great City and its Territory? Now,

(l) Optatum
inter Lectores
DOCTOREM
AUDIENTI-
UM Constitui-
mus. *Ep. 29.*
p. 55.

(m) Pavore
Mortalitatis
& temporis
accenduntur
tepidi; Con-
stringuntur
remissi; exci-
tantur ignavi;

Desertores Compelluntur ut redeant; GENTILES Coguntur ut CREDANT; vetus fidelium populus ad quietem vocatur; ad aciem RECENS & COPIOSUS EXERCITUS robore fortiore Colligitur. *De Mort. p. 162.*

(n) Subveniat Pupianus & Sententiam, dicat, & Judicium Dei & Christi in acceptum referat; Ne tantus fidelium Numerus qui sub NOBIS accersitus est, sine spe Salutis & pacis ex-

isse videatur ; Nec NOVUS CREDENTIUM POPULUS nullam per NOS consecutos esse Baptismi & Spiritus Sancti gratiam judicetur. *Ep. 66. p. 167.*

(o) Semper magnis sensibus—literis tuis locutus es Cypriane dilectissime — sic nos in fide facis Crescere, & de SEculo HOMINES AD CREDULITATEM ACCEDERE. *Ep. 77. p. 234.*

HOW many Contradictions to all the Laws, to all the § LXV.
Congruities of Order and Policy, of Discipline and Government, of Obvious Reason and Common Sense, must it needs imply, that one should bear the Characters of *Priest in Chief*, and *Ruler in Chief*, of *Pastor in Chief*, and *Judge in Chief*, in a word, have all the *Prerogatives* accounted for above, and all for the Conservation of the Purity, the Unity, the Prosperity, the Dignity, &c. of the Society ; and not only so, but bear all these Characters, and possess all those Prerogatives in such sort, as to be peculiarly and singularly Accountable to our Great Lord and Master, for all these Sacred Interests of the Church, and yet that Men of Age, who, for the former Tract of their Life, had, both by Principle and Practice, been avowed Enemies of the Society, should, without him, nay, perhaps in opposition to him, and whether he would or not, have been received into the Society, and admitted to the Privileges of it ? I say, in opposition to him, &c. For how presumable is it, that every day it would have been so, if Presbyters might have Baptized without him ? Are we not told that, *De Facto*, there was such a Principle of Malice and Grudge, such a Propensity to Independency in some of the Presbyters of *Carthage*, as prompted them to Absolve the *Lapsers* without their Bishop's knowledge, or allowance ? Are we not taught, that this their presumption was notoriously against all the then Canons and Customs of the Church ? And that not only by Bishops, but by all Catholick Christians, Presbyters as well as others, they were Condemned for it, all the World over ? How clever would such Presbyters have been at Baptizing without him, if they might have done it Canonically ? What needs more ? If it might have been done Canonically, 'tis plain, the most peaceable and sober Presbyters might have done it. For what should have stopp'd their doing of it, if there was no Legal Restraints in the Case ? If they might have done it Lawfully ? There seems to me to be so much plain Demonstration in what I have said, that I am apt to think that G. R. when he humbles himself to consider it, will find him-
self

self obliged to confess that no more needed be added on this Subject. But I have resolved, once for all, to assert this *Episcopal Prerogative*, and therefore seeing I have them, I shall not grudge to give him some more Arguments for it. Particularly,

§ LXVI.

(p) § LXIV.
(n)

HOW many plain Testimonies might be collected from our Martyrs Writings, to this purpose? *e. g.* just now I transcribed one, to prove that there were many Converted from Heathenism to Christianity, in the days of his Episcopacy. (p) And a Testimony it is, which serves with equal force to prove the Bishop's *Sovereign Power* of Baptism. *Pupianus* had alledged (as has been observed before) that our Martyr was no Bishop. Our Martyr musters up a great many Arguments in his own Vindication; among them there is this One, *Ab Absurdo*, as they call it. If he was not a true Bishop, if he had not a true Title to the *Episcopal Chair*, it would necessarily follow that none of those, who, in the *Diocese* he had pretended to be Bishop of, had been Converted to Christianity, had been either *Baptized* or *Confirmed*. This is undeniably his Argument. Now it is certain, he by himself had not Baptized all those who had been Converted during those *Six Years*. Two of the *Six* were the Years of his Retirement; all which time he was not within his *Diocese* to Baptize them. Besides, who questions that in those days Presbyters, and even Deacons, were frequently, perhaps ordinarily, the Actual Administrators of Baptism? Now I ask, How is it possible to make his Argument conclude the Intended Absurdity, without supposing him to have had the *Sovereign Power* of Baptism, and that his Presbyters and Deacons did not Administer it, but in Subordination to him, in Dependence on him, and by Allowance from him? Upon this Supposition it doth indeed conclude it irresistibly, but I must leave it to G. R. to shew how it could possibly conclude it without this Supposition, for it will not do for me. Twenty more such Testimonies, obvious in our Martyrs Writings, it were easy to insist on.

§ LXVII.

AS easy it were to adduce the as plain Testimonies of many of his Contemporaries, *v. g.* *Nemesianus* a *Thubunis*, in the very beginning of his *Suffrage*, in the Venerable Council of *Carthage*, Anno 256. Reasons against the Validity of the Baptisms performed by Hereticks or Schismaticks, from this very Topick, *That their PRÆPOSITI, their Bishops were*

Falso

False Christs and False Prophets. (q) Let G. R. try if he can put the Argument in *Form*, without taking in the *Bishops Sovereign Power* in Baptism. I Decree (says *Secundianus a Cadius*) that those who flee from the Snares of Hereticks to the Church be Baptized by Us : (r) By US, says he, meaning Catholick Bishops, as Contradistinguished from all other Clergy men, Presbyters as well as others ; for such were all those to whom he directed his Discourse ; none but Bishops, as shall be shewn hereafter, (s) had *Decisive Voices* in the Council ; and to none but Bishops did those, who Voted, direct their Discourses, when they gave their Suffrages. This is a Key I advise G. R. to make use of, if he would come to the True Sense and Purpose of many of the Suffrages contain'd in the Records of that Council, e. g. The Suffrage of *Nomianus a Tucca*, which runs to this purpose : *Seeing Christ is the Truth, we ought to follow the Truth rather than Custom : And therefore let Us, with the Baptism of the Church, Sanctify those who come to Us from Heresy, because, without, they could receive nothing.* (t) And, *we ought not so to deceive Hereticks by our Presumption, (says Secundianus a Thameis) as to give them Occasion, when the Day of Judgment comes, to Impute it to Us, that such as were not Baptized in the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and so came short of the Remission of Sins, were not Baptized by Us, nor obtain'd the Indulgence of the Divine Favour.* (u) In both these Suffrages, as well as *Secundianus's*, and divers others, I do affirm, Catholick Bishops are always meant by the Pronoun [US,] so frequently repeated in them : Catholick Bishops, I say, as those who were Vested with the Sovereign Power of Baptism. Would you have yet more ? Then,

(q) Baptisma quod dant Hæretici & Schismatici non esse verum, ubiq; in Scripturis Sanctis decaratum est ; Quoniam ipsi PRÆPOSITI eorum Falsi Christi sunt & Falsi Prophetae.

Suff. 5. (r) Censeo eos qui de infidiis Hæreticorum Confugiant ad Ecclesiam baptizandos esse à NOBIS qui amici Dei appellati sumus de ejus Dignatione.

Suff. 11. (s) Infra, Cap. VII.

(t) Cum Christus veritas sit, magis veritatem quam Consuetudinem sequi debemus, ut Hæreticos qui ideo ad NOS veniunt quia

FORIS nihil accipere potuerunt Ecclesiæ baptismo Sanctificemur. Suff. 77. (u) Non debemus Hæreticos Nostra presumptione decipere ut in Ecclesia Domini Nostri J. C. non Baptizati, ac per hoc remissionem peccatorum non Consecuti, cum Judicii dies venerit, NOBIS imputent, quod per NOS non sint Baptizati, & Indulgentiam divinæ gratiæ Consecuti : propter quod, cum sit Una Ecclesia, & Unum Baptisma, quando ad NOS Convertuntur, simul cum Ecclesia & Ecclesiæ Baptismum Consequantur. Suff. 80.

W H A T can be plainer than the Suffrage of *Confessor Saturninus a Thucca* ? Tho' the Gentiles worship Idols, (says he) yet they Know and Confess the Great God, the Father and Creator : Against this Great God Marcion Blasphemes ; yet some are not asham'd to Ratify Marcion's Baptism. How can such

(v) Gentiles
quamvis Idola
Colant, tamen
Summum De-
um Patrem
Creatorem
Cognoscunt
& Conſtituntur.
In hunc Mar-
cion blaſphe-
mat: Et qui-
dam non eru-
beſcunt Mar-
cionis Baptif-
mum probare.
Quomodo ta-
les SACER-
DOTES SA-
CERDOTI-
UM DEI aut
Servant aut
Vindicant, qui
hoſtes Dei non
Baptizant &

ſuch PRIESTS either Hold or Vindicate the PRIESTHOOD of GOD, who Communicate with God's Enemies without Baptizing them? (v) I need not, I think, be at pains, here, to prove that by PRIESTS, he meant BISHOPS; or, by the PRIESTHOOD of GOD, the EPISCOPAL OFFICE: Of the Signification of theſe Terms, in the Dialect of thoſe Times, we have had enough already. (w) *Saturninus* has indeed, here, given Us a pretty good Definition of a Biſhop, viz. That he is the PRIEST, whoſe Province it is to De- fend and Maintain the PRIESTHOOD of GOD, and who has the Power of Admitting to the Communion of the Church. And this helps us with another Key for opening up the Meaning of a great many more of the Suffrages of that Venerable Council: Particularly, all thoſe wherein Biſhops are Reſented as having the Power of Receiving into the Com- munion of the Church: For, if they had that Power, Com- mon Senſe cannot but infer, that they had the Sovereign Power of Baptiſm: And of Suffrages, either plainly Affirm- ing, or undoubtedly Implying, that they had that Power, you have a *Specimen* on the Margent. (x)

fic illis COMMUNICANT? *Suff.* 52. (w) § XXXIII, &c. (x) Sicut Cæcus Cæcum ducens ſimul in foveam Cadunt, ita Hæreticus & Hæreticum baptizans ſimul in Mortem Ca- dunt: Et ideo Hæreticus baptizandus eſt & innovandus, ne NOS vivi Mortuis Communique- mus. *Felix à Bagoa*, *Suff.* 12.

Dativus à Badis dixit, NOS quantum in NOBIS eſt Hæreticis non COMMUNICAMUS niſi Baptizati in Eccleſia fuerint, &c. *Suff.* 15.

Privatus à Suſibus dixit, Qui Hæreticorum baptiſmum probat, quid aliud quam Hæreticis Communicat? *Suff.* 20.

Victor à Gor dixit, cum peccata non niſi in Eccleſiæ Baptiſmo remittantur qui Hæreticum AD COMMUNICATIONEM ſine baptiſmo ADMITTIT, utrumq; contra rationem facit: Nec Hæreticos purgat, & Chriſtianos inquinat. *Suff.* 40.

Aurelius ab Utica dixit, cum dicat Apoſtolus non COMMUNICANDUM peccatis alienis, quid aliud quam peccatis alienis COMMUNICAT qui Hæreticis ſine Eccleſiæ baptiſmo COM- MUNICAT? & ideo Cenſeo baptizandos eſſe Hæreticos ut accipiant Remiſſam peccatorum & ſic illis COMMUNICETUR. *Suff.* 41.

Marcellus à Zam dixit, cum peccata non niſi in Eccleſiæ Baptiſmo remittantur, Qui Hæ- reticum non Baptizat peccatori COMMUNICAT. *Suff.* 53.

Natalis ab Oea dixit, Tam ego præſens quam *Pompeius Subraterſis*, quam *Dioga* etiam *Lepti- magnenſis*, qui mihi Mandaverunt, Corpore quidem Abſentes Spiritu præſentes, Cenſemus quod COLLEGÆ noſtri, quod Hæretici COMMUNICATIONEM habere NOBISCUM non poſſunt niſi — Baptizati fuerint. *Suff.* 83, 84, 85.

§ LXIX. TWO Testimonies more before I leave this Council; one ſhall be the Suffrage of *Geminus à Furnis*. Some of our COL- LEGUES (ſays he) may prefer Hereticks to themſelves, but they

they must not prefer them to Us ; and therefore WE hold what WE have once Decreed, viz. That We ought to Baptize those who come from Hereticks. (y) Let G. R. remember what I have Discoursed above, (z) and then let him tell me if they were any other than Bishops, whom Bishop *Geminus* doth here call his COLLEAGUES : But if they were only Bishops, only Members of the Episcopal COLLÈGE, who, by Rati-tying Heretical Baptisms, preferred Hereticks to themselves, then I can refer it to any Man to determine whether They were any other than Bishops, who had the *Sovereign Power* of Baptism. The other Suffrage shall be that of *Confessor Clarus à Muscula* : We have had it before, but it deserves a Repetition. The Determination of Our Lord *Jesus Christ* (says he) is manifest, for he SENT his APOSTLES, and committed to THEM ALONE, the Power given him by his Father : To them WE (Bishops) have SUCCEEDED, by the SAME POWER Governing the Church of Christ, and BAPTIZING the Faith of Believers : Hereticks therefore being WITHOUT, and having neither the POWER nor the Church of Christ, can Baptize no body with his Baptism. (a) If this Testimony does not prove that by this Father's (which were indeed the then Common) Principles, Bishops had the Sovereign Power of Baptism, 'tis Folly to think on proving any thing by Testimonies.

(y) Quidam de COLLEGIS Hæreticos præponere sibi possunt, nobis non possunt : & ideo quod semel Decrevimus tenemus, ut ab Hæreticis venientes Baptizemus. Suff. 59.

(z) Supra, § XVIII, &c.

(a) Manifesta est Sententia D. N. J. C. APOSTOLOS suos MITTENTIS & IPSIS SOLIS

POTESTATEM à Patre sibi datam PERMITTENTIS QUIBUS NOS SUCCESSIMUS, EADEM POTESTATE Ecclesiam Dei Gubernantes & Credentium Fidem BAPTIZANTES : Et ideo Hæretici qui nec Potestatem FORIS, nec Ecclesiam Christi habent, Neminem baptizare baptismo ejus possunt. Suff. 79.

I AM aware that divers of these Testimonies, which I § LXX. have adduced, may seem to be Obscure, and to bring no great Light to the Main Conclusion, to such as are Strangers to the Monuments of those Times. I am unwilling to leave any in the dark ; I desire therefore that Recourse may be had to the next Chapter, (b) where they may find as much (b) § XX, &c. as may satisfy them that I have not adduced so much as one Testimony which was not proper for my purpose. And the same Advertisement I give about another Argument, which seems to me to be of no small Force : It is this,

WHEN any Questions, any Difficulties were started, in § LXXI. those Times concerning Baptism, Bishops, and Bishops alone, in their Provincial Synods, were the Deciders and Determin-

R r

nators

nators of them. How could they have done so, if Presbyters had had an *Equal Interest* with them in the *Power* of Baptism? Were not Presbyters more numerous than Bishops? Our Presbyterian Brethren cannot deny that they were. What Scheme of Order, then, what Rule of Government, what possible Congruity of Reason, could have made it Equitable? Or rather, what could possibly have covered the Gross and Staring Absurdity of it, that a *few* should have had the *Monopoly* of *Decisive Voices*, where so *many* were *equally* concerned? Will our Brethren allow such a *Privilege* to their *Moderators*? Can it consist with the Fundamental Principles of Presbyterian Government, that *Moderators* of *Presbyteries*, in their own *Right*, and by their being such, should Meet, in Course, Twice every Year, at Stated Times, in Formal, Stated, Regulated Synods, and *Decide* Controversies about Matters wherein *all Presbyters* are as much Interested as *They*? And this too, with this Addition of Affront to Presbyters, that as many of them as please may be present in those *Synods*, but without the Privilege of *Decisive Voices*, tho' they have *Equal Right* to it with the *Moderators* themselves? This Argument, I am hopeful, G. R. himself will acknowledge to be a plain Demonstration of the Bishops *Sovereign Power* in Baptism, in the *Cyprianic Age*, if it shall be made appear that Bishops, as such, Bishops in their *own Right*, and not by any Delegation from their Respective Presbyteries, did thus Meet in *Synods*, in that Age, and Determine Emergent Controversies about *Baptism*; Determin'd them, I say, by themselves, by their own *sole Definitive Suffrages*, and without allowing to *Presbyters* any *Interest* in the *Definition*. Now, for the full Proof of this, I refer him to the next Chapter. (c) And yet, let me tell him, It is not any Penury of Arguments that makes me lay so much stress on this, I have just now Named, for if it were needful, Arguments might be brought from all Quarters: Thus for Example,

(c) Chap. VII.
§ XX.

§ LXXII.

(d) H. E. L. 7.
C. 9.

W H A T plainer Demonstration of the Bishops Sovereign Power in Baptism can be reasonably required, than we have in that remarkable Epistle of *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, Recorded by *Eusebius*. (d) The Matter is this, in short: There was a certain Man who had been Baptized in some Heretical Communion: He had deserted that Communion, and come over to the Communion of the Catholick Church
of

of *Alexandria* : He had been Received without any other Baptism then that he had got while in Herefy : He had lived very long in the Communion of the Catholick Church of *Alexandria*, and been Admitted to all the Privileges of it : At last, he had been present at the Celebration of Catholick Baptism in this Catholick Communion . This puts him in great Confusion : He is is sensible that there is a vast Difference between this Catholick Baptism and that which he had Received : And he is Apprehensive that he has never yet Received the Remission of Sins : He has never yet been validly Baptized : He comes therefore to *Dionysius* then Bishop of *Alexandria* : He throws himself down at his feet, and makes the dolefullest Lamentations imaginable, bewailing his miserable Condition, and crying most passionately that he might be Baptized with Catholick Baptism, without which, he thought himself in a lost Condition. *Dionysius* does what he can to Encourage him, and Quiet his Conscience : He does not think it safe, nor seasonable, to Baptize him, after he had been for so many Years a Communicant : He therefore bids him take Heart, and continue in the Communion of the Church, and live as becomes a Christian, and he assures him all may be well enough with him. Now, I say, nothing can be brighter than the Bishops *Sovereign Power* of Baptism is, in the Account of this Matter, which *Dionysius* himself gives by an Epistle to *Xystus* Bishop of *Rome*. The Afflicted Man comes straight to *Dionysius*, and throws himself down at his Feet, and represents his Case to him : *Dionysius* does not at all Act as a *Presbyterian Moderator* in the Matter. Tho' there was a goodly Number of Presbyters belonging to the Church of *Alexandria*, as is evident from his own Accounts, (e) yet he doth not Convocate them : He doth not bring the Case before them : He doth not either *Reserve* or *Refer* it to their *Decision*. No such thing so much as insinuated in the whole Account : Nay, no Insinuation of so much as *Consulting* them in the Matter : He speaks all along of himself in the *Singular Number*, as being the *Only Actor*, and the *Only Determiner* of the Case. The Afflicted Man (as I have said) comes to him, throws himself at his Feet, cries to him for Relief, that he may be Sanctified, and have the Remission of his Sins sealed to him by true Catholick Baptism. He says, He durst not Baptize him, or, he did not think fit to do it, after the Man had been so long a Commu-

(e) See and compare Euseb. H. E. Lib. 7. Cap. 11. 20, 22.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

nicant, having been one, not only before his own, but, so far as he knew, even before his Predecessor *Heractas* had been promoted to the *Bishoprick*. He will not Baptize him therefore, but allows him to continue as he is, and assures him, he need not entertain doubts concerning his Salvability, &c. And all this was so much *Dionysius* his own *single Conduct*, as being *Bishop*, in the Matter, that he plainly tells *Xystus*, He is not confident that the Measure he had taken was absolutely right; and therefore he craves *Xystus*'s Advice and Resolution in the Matter. Let G. R. or any Man, consult *Eusebius*, and I am confident he shall find I have given a faithful account of the Story: But if I have, let any Reader judge if *Dionysius* has not had the *Sovereign Power* of *Baptism* in the Church of *Alexandria*; a Church in which there was no small number of Presbyters.

¶ LXXIII.

NOTHING easier, as I have said, than thus to multiply Arguments in Confirmation of this Episcopal *Prerogative*: But that I may not turn over tedious to my Reader, I shall now confine my self to the Grand Controversy which was agitated in *St. Cyprian's Time*, concerning Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms. This Controversy alone, when attended to, with even but an ordinary Application of Mind, will afford us Arguments enough. Indeed, the Bishop's *Sovereign Power* in *Baptism*, is all along supposed by the Advocates on both sides, in their whole Management of it, particularly, 1. It is supposed, or rather Implicitly Asserted by Both, in the very State of the Controversy. 2. Both proceed upon the supposition of it, in all their best Arguments. And 3. It is most distinctly pointed out by both, in one of the most remarkable Results of the Controversy.

¶ LXXIV.

FIRST, I say, The Bishop's *Sovereign Power* of *Baptism* was supposed, or rather Implicitly Asserted, by the Advocates on both sides, in the very State of the Controversy. The State of it was very plainly this: *Stephen*, Bishop of *Rome*, and his Party, maintain'd, that by the Evangelical Law, Catholick Bishops were Bound to *Ratify* Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, and to hold them as Good and Valid; And to Admit such as, having been Baptized by Hereticks or Schismatics, deserted them, and came over to the True Catholick Communion, without giving them Catholick Baptism, or using any other Rite at their Reception, than that of *Imposing the Hand*, for the Collation of the *Holy Ghost*.

On the other hand, St. Cyprian, and those who sided with him, maintain'd, That Catholick Bishops were obliged to *Irritate* all such Baptisms, and hold them as *Void* and *Null*; and by consequence, not straight to *Confirm*, but first to *Baptize* all such as, having received no other than those False Baptisms, in those False and Antichristian Communion, left them, and came over to the One, True, Catholick, and only Salutory Communion. This, I say, was the true State of the Controversy; and thus the Bishops *Sovereign Interest* in *Baptism* was evidently supposed, in it, by both Parties, in as much as the Question was, Whether Bishops were bound to *Ratify* or *Irritate* such Baptisms: For if it was their *peculiar Province* to be the *Ratifiers* or *Voiders* of them, the consequence is irresistible, *viz.* That they were *Vested* with the *Sovereign Power* of *Baptism*.

ALL therefore that can be requisite to compleat the Art. § LXXV.. ment, is, To prove that it was all along supposed by both Parties, that the Bishops were the Persons to whom it belong'd to *Ratify* or *Irritate* such *Baptisms*. And this, tho' we had no more, might sufficiently appear from this one thing, That they were the *Bishops* who had the *Power* to *Receive* those who came from *Heresy* or *Schism*, into the Communion of the Church. By the constant current Practice, by all the Analogies of the Government, and Discipline of those Times, none could be *Received* into the Communion of the Church without the Bishops. *Lapsers* could not be *Reconciled* without them, as we shall see hereafter, much less those who had been engaged in *Heresy* or *Schism*, Crimes, by the Principles of those Times, more Heinous and Atrocious than *Lapsing* it self. It might appear farther from this, that the Question was, Whether *Imposing the Hand*, for the *Collation* of the *Holy Ghost*, was sufficient? Or, Whether *Baptism* was also *Necessary*? Now, 'tis certain, and acknowledged, (as hereafter we shall learn) that if no more was *Necessary* for their *Reception* than such *Imposition* of the *Hand*, it being the Bishops Province to *Impose* the *Hand* for the *Collation* of the *Holy Ghost*, he had the full *Power* to *receive* them. By necessary consequence, he had the *Sovereign Power* of *Baptism*, if *Baptism* was also *Necessary* for their *Reception*; otherwise, it should have intirely depended on him in the one case, but not in the other. Divers other such Reasonings might be insisted on, but 'tis not needful; for, indeed,

§ LXXVI.

WE have abundance of plain and direct Testimonies, to prove, that the Ratification or Reprobation of such Baptisms belonged to the Bishops. What can be plainer, than that which our Martyr has in the beginning of his Epistle to *Jubaianus*? *Thou hast written to me, Dear Brother, says he, desiring to know my Sentiment concerning the Baptism of Hereticks: They, being out of the Church, Assume to themselves that which they neither have Right to, nor is in their Power, their Baptism, therefore, WE cannot RATIFY, nor hold as valid, seeing it is certain that with them it is unlawful.*

(f) *Scriptisti mihi, F. C. Desiderans significari tibi motum animi nostri quid nobis videatur de Hæreticorum Baptismo, qui FORIS positi & extra Ecclesiam Constituti vindicant sibi rem ne JURIS SUI nec POTESTATIS,*

quod NOS nec RATUM possumus, nec legitimum judicare, &c. Ep. 73. p. 198.

(g) *Neq; enim parva res Hæreticis & Modica conceditur quando à NOBIS (Episcopis Catholicis, quales erant tam Jubaianus quam Cyprianus) Baptisma eorum IN ACCEP- TUM REFERTUR, &c. ibid. p. 203.*

(h) *Quo in loco Considerandum est, F. C. pro Fide & Religione SACERDOTALIS LOCI quo fungimur, an Constare SACERDOTIS DEI ratio in die Judicii possit ASSERENTIS & PROBANTIS & IN ACCEP- TUM REFERENTIS blasphemantium Baptismata. Ep. 74. p. 214.*

§ LXXVII.

ST. CYPRIAN, and those who sided with him, being very Earnest to Dissuade those to whom it belong'd to Ratify or Reprobate Baptisms, from Ratifying Heretical or Schismatical Baptisms, have Instanced in a great many Characters which they did bear, or, a great many Reduplications under which they might be considered, to infer from them that they ought not to Ratify such Baptisms. I shall here give a Specimen of such Reduplications, and let G. R. consider them, and lay them together, and then say, if he can, that they are not generally such as were peculiar to Bishops. They pleaded, that those whose Province it was to Ratify or Re-
probate

probate Baptisms, ought to *Reprobate*, and not to *Ratify* Heretical or Schismatical Baptisms, 1. As being those who *had* and *held Churches*, (i) which, as I have already shewn, (k) is a Phrase, in the Dialect of those Times, Equivalent to that of *holding Bishopricks*. 2. They ought not to *Ratify* such Baptisms, as being those, who, by the Divine Favour, were Entrusted with the Administration of the Priesthood of God.

(l) And, 3. As those who were Vested with the Sacerdotal Authority and Power. (m) Both which Reduplications, I have likewise shewn above, (n) belong'd to Bishops in a peculiar manner. 4. They ought not to *Ratify* them, as they were Successors to the Apostles in the Ecclesiastical Supremacy. (o) 5. As being those who presided in the Church. (p) 6. And were the Governours, the Steers-men who sat at the Helm of the Ship. (q) 7. As those, who by their Station, were obliged to be the Chief Champions for the Truth of God. (r) 8. And the Chief Maintainers of the Divine Honour. (s) 9. And the Chief Defenders of the Faith. (t) 10. And the Great Conservators of Unity. (u) 11. And the Chief Administrators of Discipline. (v) As being those, 12. To whom the Custody of the Spouse of Christ was chiefly committed. (w) And, 13. Those who were set over the Camp of Christ, as the Chief Officers of his Army. (x) 14. As the Heads of Christian Communion. (y) 15. As Members of a College peculiar to themselves, A College of Chief Governours; A College on which, to *Ratify* Heretical Baptisms, was a mighty Reflection. (z) Nay, 16. They were obliged not to *Ratify* them, as being the Guardians of Baptism. (a) And, 17. As the very Heads of it. (b) Under all these Reduplications (and perhaps many more) did those lie, who had the Power of *Ratifying* or *Repudiating* Baptisms: And by virtue of them, they were obliged to *Repudiate* Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, by the Principles of St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries. Now, I hope, I need not tell G. R. over again, That if they were the Bishops who had thus the Power to *Ratify* or *Reprobate* Baptisms, it must follow by necessary consequence that they had the *Sovereign Power of Baptism*.

(i) Ep. 69. p. 181. vide infra, §
(k) Cap. V. § XXX.

(l) Quare quicum Domino Sumus & Unitatem Dei tenemus, & Secundum ejus dignationem. SACERDOTIUM EIUS in Ecclesia ADMINISTRAMUS quaecumque; Adversarii ejus & Antichristi faciunt, Repudiare & Rejicere & pro profanis habere debemus. Testimonium est 32. Episcoporum. Ep. 70. p. 192.
(m) Ad SACERDOTALEM AUCTORITATEM & ad Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitatem pariter & Dignitatem pertinet—
Haereticos & Schismaticos Baptizari oportere, &c. Ep. 72. p. 196.
Vide Ep. 73.

p. 198. (n) Supra, § XXXIII, &c. (o) Vide Ep. 73. p. 201, 202, fuse.
(p) Non enim vincimur quando offeruntur nobis meliora sed instruimur; maxime in his quae ad Ecclesiae Unitatem pertinent & Fidei & Spei nostrae veritatem, ut NOS SACER-

SECONDLY,

DOTES DEI & Ecclesiæ ejus de ipsius dignatione PRÆPOSITI Sciamus remissam Peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesia dari posse, &c. *Ep. 71. p. 195, 196.*

(q) *Hæreticorum Baptismata esse Repudianda*, Agrippinus, cum ceteris Co-episcopis suis qui illo tempore — Ecclesiam Dei GUBERNABANT, statuit, &c. *Ep. 71. p. 196. Vide plura in Martyris nostri proloquio ad Con. Carth.*

(r) Hæc (Catholica Ecclesia) est una quæ tenet & possidet omnem Sponsi sui & Domini potestatem: In hac NOS (Episcopi) PRÆSIDEMUS, pro honore ejus atq; Unitate pugnamus: Hujus & Gratiam pariter & Gloriam fidei virtute defendimus. Nos de divino permissu rigamus Sitientem Dei Populum: NOS Custodimus terminos vitalium fontium. Si possessionis ergo nostræ jus tenemus, Si Sacramentum Unitatis agnoscimus, cur pravaricores veritatis cur proditores Unitatis existimamur? &c. *Ep. 73. p. 203.*

(s) Vide *Ep. 74. p. 214. fusè*, ubi Stephanum Romanum, Episcopos qui Hæreticorum Baptismata Rata habere Nollent, Abstinenter serio perstringens noster, inter alia hæc habet dat HONOREM Deo qui Hæreticorum AMICUS & inimicus Christianorum SACERDOTES DEI veritatem Christi & Ecclesiæ Unitatem tuentes, Abstinendos putat, &c.

(t) Vide mox dicta (r) & (s) & alibi passim.

(u) Vide dicta (m) (r) (s) & passim.

(v) Vide supra, § LXXVI. (b) & passim præcipue vero, *Ep. 74. p. 214. fusè.*

(w) Christus Dominus & Deus Noster ad Patrem proficiens SPONSAM suam NOBIS (Episcopis) Commendavit: Utrumne eam incorruptam & inviolatam Custodiemus? &c. *Con. Carth. Suff. 49. Vide paria, Suff. 61. & mox. (x)*

(x) *Plurimis adversus Hæreticorum Baptismata prolatis Argumentis, Sic tandem Pompeium Collegam suum alloquitur Noster, Ep. 74. p. 214, 215. Quod si est apud Nos, Frater dilectissime, Dei Timor, si Tenor prævalet Fidei, si Custodimus Christi præcepta, si incorruptam atq; inviolatam Sponsæ ejus Sanctitatem tuemur — quasi Fideles Dei Milites, qui Deo fide & Religione sincera Militamus COMMISSA NOBIS DIVINITUS CASTRA fidei virtute servemus.*

(y) Vide supra, § & infra, Cap.

(z) Vide *Ep. 71. p. 193. fusè & supra, § imo passim.*

(a) Non est ergo F.C. quod Hæreticis Cedendum (nos Episcopi Catholici) existimemus, ut Baptisma quod non nisi Uni & Soli Ecclesiæ datum est prodendum putemus, &c. *Ep. 73. p. 202. Vide plura, supra. (r)*

(b) NOS autem qui Ecclesiæ Unius Caput & Radicem tenemus, pro certo scimus & fidemus nihil illic extra Ecclesiam licere & Baptismatis quod est Unum CAPUT NOS (Episcopos Catholicos) esse, &c. *Ep. 73. p. 198.*

§LXXVIII SECONDLY, The Bishops Sovereign Power in Baptism is farther manifest, in the Arguments insilted on by the Advocates on both sides. The *Stephanians* did, indeed, Muster up a great many Arguments for the Validity of Heretical Baptisms. They pleaded, that Hereticks themselves were not so nice as to Baptize those who came over from other Heresies to their Communion. That all *Catechumens*, who died Unbaptized, were not therefore Damned; much less those who had received Baptism, tho' from Hereticks or Schismatics. That to refuse those who were willing to forsake Heresy or Schism, unless they would Consent to be Rebaptized, was to obstruct their Coming over: That those who had been Baptized by *Philip in Samaria*, were not
Rebaptized

Rebaptized by the Apottles when they came among them, *Acts* 8. 14, &c. and that they *Received Imposition of Hands* only for the *Collation* of the *Holy Ghost*. That tho' some in *St. Paul's* Time preached Christ out of Envy and Strife, *i. e.* from a Contentious and Schismatical humour, yet he was pleas'd that Christ was preached, &c. *Phil.* 1. 15, &c. That some Schismatics, particularly the *Novatians*, observed the due Form, and propos'd the due Interrogatories in Baptism. That the Efficacy of the Sacraments did not depend on the Orthodoxy, or the Charity of the Administrators: And that if Persons were Baptized in the Name of Christ, any manner of way, it was no matter who Baptiz'd them. But the main Argument, as I have already accounted, (c) was, That (c) *Vide supra, § X, &c.* *Stephen*, Bishop of *Rome*, had had it handed down to him by *constant Tradition*, from *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, *Founders* of the *Church* of *Rome*, that who so came over from Heretical or Schismatical Communion, to the Communion of the True Catholick Church, should not be *Rebaptized*: And that all his *Predecessors*, Bishops of *Rome*, since the days of *those Apostles*, had always conform'd their Practice to such Unquestionable Tradition: They had always *Ratified*, never *Repudiated* Heretical or Schismatical Baptisms. This, I say, was the main Argument: Now who sees not that this Argument did manifestly Lodge the *Sovereign Power* of *Baptism* in the *Bishops*? On the other hand,

THE Arguments of the *Cyprianists*, as we have fuller § LXXIX. Accounts of them, so proportionably they afford greater Light to our present purpose. Let us try it in some Instances, 1. *St. Cyprian* in his 69th Epistle written to *Magnus*, the first of those in which he managed the Controversy, rejects the Baptisms of *Novatianus*, upon this very score, That he was not a *Bishop*. *Cornelius* was the *Only True Bishop* of *Rome*: No Valid Baptisms could be performed in that Church but by him, or in Dependence on him: *Novatianus* disown'd all Dependence on him, separated from him, and pretended to be *Bishop* of *Rome* in *Opposition* to him: His Baptisms therefore could not be Valid: They could not be true Christian Sacraments. That this is the true purpose of our Martyr's Argument, is evident from his own words which you have on the Margent. (d) Again, 2. In that same (d) *Qui dicit apud Novatianum Baptizari & Sanctificari aliquem posse prius Ostendat & doceat Novatianum in Ecclesia esse & Ecclesiae PRÆSIDERE. Ecclesia enim una est, quæ una & INTUS esse & FORIS*

non potest: Si enim apud Novatianum est, apud Cornelium non fuit: Si apud Cornelium fuit qui Fabiano Episcopo legitima Ordinatione Successit—Novatianus in Ecclesia non est, nec EPISCOPUS computari potest, qui Evangelica & Apostolica Traditione contempta, nemini succedens, à seipso ortus est. HABERE namq; aut TENERE Ecclesiam nullo modo potest qui Ordinatus in Ecclesia non est. Ep. 69. p. 181.

Epistle, these Three [To set up an Episcopal Chair] [To Assume a Primacy] and [To pretend to a Sovereign or Independent Power of Baptizing and Offering, i. e. Consecrating the Holy Eucharist] he plainly makes Equivalent Phrases: By all Three, expressing the *One Crime* of *Novatianus* in standing up as an *Antibishop* to *Cornelius*. (e) In a word, 3. In that same Epistle, he Reasons against the *Verity* of *Novatianus's* Baptisms from this very *Topick*, that, 4. He was not the ONE PASTOR. (f) And, 5. From this, That all his Ministrations were of the same *Kidney* with *Core*, *Dathan* and *Abiron's*, which were wicked, damnable and naught, because performed in *Opposition* to the *High Priest*, *Aaron*. (g) Can there be clearer Arguments for any thing? But I have not done,

(e) Hi (Novatianenses) Ecclesiam Scindentes—CATHE-DRAM sibi CONSTITUERE & PRIMATUM ASSUMERE & BAPTIZANDI atq; Offe-
rendi LICENTIAM Vindicare Conantur. Ibid. p. 184.

(f) Ibid. p. 184. Verba vide supra.

(g) Ibid. Verba vide supra.

§ LXXX. FOR, 6. Another Argument insisted on by our Martyr, and those of his Party, is, plainly, That it was unaccountable in their COLLEAGUES (and none but Bishops were such) to Ratify Heretical or Schismatical Baptisms. It was a Prostitution of the Honour of both; the *Catholick Church*, and the *Episcopal College*. (h) 7. To Approve and Ratify Heretical Baptisms, Naturally tended to hinder People to come over from Heresy or Schism; to come, I say, and make their humble Addresses to the *Catholick Bishops*, to be received into the Bosom and Communion of the *Catholick Church*. It Encouraged them to think themselves safe and secure enough in either Heresy or Schism: For if, there, they had True Baptism, why not likewise a True Church, and True Remission of Sins? (i) How naturally both these Arguments non oportere—porro autem quidam de COLLEGIS NOSTRIS malunt Hæreticis Honorem dare quam nobis Consentire, &c. Ep. 71. p. 193. & alibi, passim.

(i) Nam si viderint (Hæretici & Schismatici) Judicio ac Sententia NOSTRA (Episcoporum) Hi quippe Soli in Causis hujuscemodi, Judicabant, Sententiam Stringebant, Decernebant, Statuebant,

infer

&c.) id DECERNI & STATUI, ut Baptisma justum & Legitimum computetur quo ILLIC (in *Hæresi vel Schismate*) baptizantur; Putabunt se quoq; Ecclesiam & Cetera Ecclesiæ Munera justè & legitimè possidere; nec erit Causa VENIENDI AD NOS, quando habentes Baptisma habere videantur & cetera. Porro autem cum cognoscunt Baptisma nullus FORIS esse, nec Remissionem peccatorum extra Ecclesiam dari posse, avidius ad NOS & promptius properant, & Munera ac Dona Ecclesiæ Matris IMPLORANT, &c. Ep. 73. p. 209. *His paria sæpius occurrunt.*

infer the Bishops *Sovereign Power* in Baptism, must be obvious to every Reader. And what can be more irresistible than, 8. That Reasoning made use of by a whole Synod of *African Bishops*? Ep. 70. *It is necessary (say they) that he who is Baptized be Anointed: But Hereticks cannot Anoint, because they cannot Sanctify, or Consecrate the Oil: And they cannot Sanctify the Oil, because they have not an Altar to Sanctify it on.* (k) The force of which Argument lies plainly here, That no *valid Baptisms* could be performed but in *Dependence* of the ONE ALTAR, of the ONE PRIEST the Bishop. This ALTAR could be but ONE: It could not, therefore, be among Hereticks or Schismatics. What ALTARS soever these could have, was not the ONE, but ANOTHER, and a FALSE ALTAR. They could not have a TRUE one, for that could be but ONE, and that ONE TRUE one belonged to the *True Bishop*.

(k) Ungi quoque necesse est eum qui Baptizatus fit—Porro autem Eucharistia est unde Baptizati Unguntur, Oleum in ALTARI Sanctificatum: Sanctificare autem non po-

tuit Olei Creaturam qui nec ALTARE HABUIT nec Ecclesiam: Unde nec Unctio Spiritualis apud Hæreticos potest esse, quando constat Oleum Sanctificari & Eucharistiam fieri apud illos omnino non posse. Ep. 70. p. 190, 191.

HOW easy were it to mention divers other Arguments § LXXXI. insisted on by the *Cyprianists*, from which the Bishops *Sovereign Power* of Baptism might be as naturally inferred as from these I have mentioned? But I shall mention only two more. 9. Then, They pleaded that Hereticks could not Baptize, because they could not *Ordain*; which must needs import, that the *Power of Ordination*, and the *Sovereign Power* of Baptism, are *Inseparable*. *Firmilian's* words are most Express to this purpose: *No Hereticks, says he, having cut off themselves from the Church of God, can have any Power or Grace, for all Power and Grace is confined to the Church, where those Elders do Preside or Govern, who have the Power of BAPTIZING, IMPOSING the Hand, (or Confirming) and ORDAINING: For as an Heretick cannot Ordain, &c. so*

(l) Hæretici si se ab Ecclesia Dei sciderint, nihil habere potestatis aut Gratiæ possunt, quando omnis potestas & Gratiæ in Ecclesia constituta sit ubi PRÆSIDENT Major natu qui & BAPTIZANDI & Manum imponendi & ORDINANDI

possident potestatem. Hæretico enim sicut ORDINARE non licet nec Manum imponere ita nec BAPTIZARE. Ep. 75. p. 221.

(m) Secundum testimonium Scripturarum & Secundum Decretum COLLEGARUM Nostrorum Sanctissimæ Memorix Virorum, omnes Schismaticos & Hæreticos qui ad Ecclesiam Conversi sunt, BAPTIZARI: Sed & eos qui ORDINATI VIDEBANTUR inter Laicos recipi, &c. *Conc. Carth. Suff. 4.*

(n) Addimus plane & Adjungimus (*huic nempe Nostro de Hæreticorum Baptizmate rejiciendo. Decreto*) Consensu & Auctoritate Communi ut etiam si qui Presbyteri aut Diaconi, qui vel in Ecclesia Catholica prius Ordinati fuerunt——vel apud Hæreticos à Pseudo-episcopis & Antichristis contra Christi Dispositionem PROFANA ORDINATIONE promoti sint, eos quoq; hac Conditione Suscipi cum revertuntur, ut Communicent Laici, &c. Ep. 72. p. 197.

§LXXXII. BUT has not G. R. answered all my Arguments, which I insisted on, to prove that in St. Cyprian's Time, The Bishop was possessed of the Power of Ordination? Not one of them to any purpose. It is not worth while to insist minutely on his Answers, the Reader may competently Judge of his performance by one Instance. I proposed *One*, and that the *Only* Instance produceable, which could be pretended to have been an Instance of an Ordination not performed by a Bishop, in the days of St. Cyprian: The Instance of *Felicissimus* his being made a Deacon, by the Interest of *Novatus*, who was *only* a Presbyter. I shewed, to a Demonstration, that it could do our Presbyterian Brethren no Service: I shewed it was impossible to make it appear, that *Novatus* Ordain'd *Felicissimus*. I deduced the Matter thus: St. Cyprian's words are, *Ipse (Novatus) est qui Felicissimum satellitem suum, Diaconum nec permittente me, nec Sciente, sua factione & Ambitione*

tione Constituit. (o) These words, I said, did not in the (o) Ep. 52. least import, that *Novatus* Ordain'd *Felicissimus*: They imported no more, than that he had so much *Interest* and *Influence* as to get him *Ordained*, without St. Cyprian's *Knowledge* or *Allowance*. I gave this Reason for my saying so, That St. Cyprian, in that same Epistle, says of that same *Novatus*, that *he went next to Rome, and there made a Bishop*: His words are, *Quid istic (Carthagini) Episcopum FECIT.* I said there was here, evidently, as much said for *Novatus* his *Ordaining* a *Bishop* at *Rome*, as for his *Ordaining* a *Deacon* at *Carthage*. But then I added, that it was certain *Novatus* did not *Ordain* the *Bishop* at *Rome*: For *Cornelius* tells us expressly, that *Novatianus* (who was the Man) *was Ordained by Three Bishops*: (p) By good consequence, I said, it was im- (p) Euseb. possible to prove, from St. Cyprian's words, that *Novatus* E. H. Lib. 6. Ordain'd *Felicissimus*. Now consider G. R's Answer to this C. 43. Reasoning, it is even not one word more, nor one word less, than this: [*Cyprian's words are plain; Felicissimum Diaconum sua factione Constituit*]. (q) Now, I will not say that this (q) § 40. p. 55. Answer Smells of Brags, or is the Brood of Brevity; I shall say no more, than that as Zealous as G. R. has been to represent me as a *Papist*, yet there is not a Syllable in all my Book, that looks more *Popish* like than this Answer of his. For my part, I never saw any thing look liker the *Renown'd Plea*, commonly used in Defence of *Transubstantiation*, against all the Demonstrations were ever brought against it: [Our Saviour's words are plain, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, This is my Body] And so I leave it.

THE other Argument insisted on by the *Cyprianists*, and **SLXXXIII.** which most clearly proves the Bishops *Sovereign Power* in *Baptism*, is, 10. That none had *Power* to *Baptize*, who had not likewise the *Power* of *Giving* the *Holy Ghost*, by the *Imposition* of the *Hand*; which Administration I shall hereafter presume, for brevity, to call *Confirmation*. No Argument more frequently insisted on, or more keenly pressed by them. The *Stephanians* conceded that Hereticks, and Schismatics, could not *Confirm*: From which Concession, the *Cyprianists* reasoned to this purpose, That if Hereticks and Schismatics could not *Confirm*, neither could they *Baptize*; if they could *Baptize*, they could also *Confirm*. This Reasoning St. Cyprian has in his 69th Epistle to *Magnus*, (r) in

(r) Qui (Baptismatum Hæreticorum Schismaticorumve Patroni) quoniam pertinaces alias & indociles, vel hoc tamen Confi-
tentur quod Universi five Hæretici five Schismatici non habeant Spiritum Sanctum & ideo Baptizare quidem possint, dare autem SP. SANCTUM non possint; in hoc ipso à nobis tenentur ut ostendamus nec Baptizare omnino eos posse, qui non habeant Sp. Sanctum. Quibusdam deinde ad probationem inter-
jectis Scrip-
testimoniis, sic
pergit. Itaq;
qui Hæreticis
five Schisma-
ticis patrocina-

nantur Respondeant nobis habeant ne SPIRITUM SANCTUM an non habeant; si habent cur illic (in Hæresi vel Schismate) Baptizatis, quando ad nos veniunt, MANUS IMPONITUR ad accipiendum SPIRITUM SANCTUM, cum jam utiq; illic acceptus sit, ubi, si fuit, dari potuit? Si autem FORIS cuncti Hæretici & Schismatici non habent SPIRITUM SANCTUM, & ideo apud Nos MANUS IMPONITUR, ut hic (in Catholica) accipiatur, quod illic non est, nec dari potest, Manifestum est nec Remissionem peccatorum dari per eos posse, quod constat Spiritum Sanctum non habere, &c. Ep. 69. p. 185.

(s) Quod si Secundum pravam fidem Baptizari aliquis foris & Remissam peccatorum consequi potuit, Secundum eandem fidem consequi & SP. SANCTUM potuit; & non est Necessè venienti MANUM IMPONI, ut SP. SANCTUM consequatur & SIGNETUR: Aut Utrumq; enim Fides FORIS potuit, aut Neutrum eorum qui FORIS fuerat accepit. Ep. 73. p. 201.

(r) in his 73d to *Jubaianus*, (s) and in his 74th to *Pompeius*. (t) *Firmilian* has it thrice in his Epistle to St. *Cyprian*; (u) *Nemesianus a Thubunis*, (v) *Succensus Abbir Germanicana*, (w) and *Secundinus a Carpis*, (x) insist on it in their *Suffrages* in the Council of *Carthage*, whereof *Cyprian* was *Præses*, Anno 256. It is insisted on by a whole Prior Provincial Council of *Bishops*, in their *Synodical Epistle*, which is the 70th among *St. Cyprian's*. (y) I have transcribed some of their Testimonies on the Margent, whereby the Reader may sufficiently understand the Argument. The force of it lies visibly in this, That the Powers of *Baptism* and *Confirmation* were *Inseparable*. He who could perform *One*, could perform *Both*: He that could not perform *Both*, could perform *Neither*. And the force of my Argument deduced from this Reasoning lies here, That the *Bishop* had the *same Power* of *Baptizing* which he had of *Confirming*: But it is certain, that by the *Principles* of those *Times*, he had the *Sovereign Power* of *Confirmation*; I say, the *Sovereign Power* of it: For tho' it be clear as Light, in the Monuments of those *Times*, that all *Confirmations* were *ordinarily* performed by the *Bishop* in Person, yet I will not say that he was so strictly Bound to do so, as that he could not have Delegated *Presbyters*, and, perhaps, *Deacons*, to have perform'd it by *Commission*, and in *Dependence* on him. I have not yet discovered in the Nature of the Thing, any thing binding up his Hands from giving such *Delegations* or *Commissions*, in the Case of *Confirmation*, more than in *Baptism*, *Consecrating the Eucharist*, or *Reconciling Penitents*. And it is manifest, that such *Delegations*, or *Deputations*, are so far from amounting to any *Diminution* of his *Sovereign Power*, that, on the contrary, they are rather Arguments and Illustrations of it.

(z) Si Effectum Baptismi Majestati Nominis tribuunt, ut qui in Nomine Christi ubicunq; & quomodocunq; Baptizantur, innovati & Sanctificati judicentur, cur non in ejusdem Christi Nomine illic & MANUS IMPONITUR ad Accipiendum SP. SANCTUM? Cur eadem Majestas Nominis non praevaleret MANUS IMPOSITIONE quam Valuisse contendunt in Baptismi Sanctificatione? Nam si potest quis extra Ecclesiam Natus Templum Dei fieri, cur non posset super Templum & Sp. Sanctus infundi? Ep. 74. p. 213.

(u) Vide Ep. 75. p. 221, 223, 226.

(v) Con. Carth. Suff. 5.

(w) Con. Carth. Suff. 16.

(x) Hæretici Christiani sunt, an Non? Si Christiani sunt, cur in Ecclesia Dei non sunt? Si Christiani non sunt, quomodo Christianos faciunt?—Unde Constat super filios alienos—Spiritus Sanctum per MANUS IMPOSITIONEM tantum modo non posse descendere, cum Manifestum sit Hæreticos Baptisma non habere. Suff. 24.

(y) Neq; enim potest pars illic (in Hæresi) inanis esse & pars prævalere. Si Baptizare potuit, potuit & Sp. S. dare: Si autem Sp. S. dare potest quia foris Institutus cum Sp. S. non est, nec BAPTIZARE venientem potest, &c. Ep. 70. p. 191.

WHAT I have said, might in all Reason be enough on § LXXXIV: this Argument: But having to do with G. R. I find my self obliged to do two things, viz. 1. To shew what St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries meant by the *Imposition of the Hand*, for the *Collation of the Holy Ghost*. 2. To shew, that by the Principles of those Times, the *Ministry* of this Rite belong'd to the *Bishop*. Both these Tasks G. R. has prescribed to me: For I had affirmed, (z) that by the Practice of the Church, (z) Prin. Cyp. in those Days, The *Bishop* was the *sole Administrator of it*: Age, p. 38. And G. R. (a) has said, that *he knows not what St. Cyprian (a) § 39. p. 52, meant by such Imposition of the Hand*: And, whatever it was, 53, 54. that my Arguments were not sufficient to prove that the *Ministry of it was peculiar to the Bishop*.

1. G. R. pretends not to know what St. Cyprian meant by § LXXXV. the *Imposition of the Hand* for the *Collation of the Holy Ghost*, and yet he is very sure, *It is not the Confirmation, which, in our days, goes under that Name*. In short, G. R. Discourfing this Point, most Confidently affirms that which is Impossible for him to make appear to be True; and he seriously professes not to know that which may easily be known. He most Confidently affirms that which is Impossible for him to make appear to be true. Take it in his own words; for as I always hate, so, here, I have no Temper to be Injurious to him. *Confirmation of the Adult*, says he, *who in their Infancy had been Baptized, at first, was no more but after diligent Instructing them in the Grounds of Religion, bringing them to the Pastor of the Church (and probably before the Eldership) that they might be Tried in their Proficiency, and so declared fit*

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

fit to receive the Lord's Supper; in which nothing can be blamed. Afterward it came to be more Theatrically managed, and Imposition of Hands was the Ceremony by which it was set off, till at last it came to be esteem'd a Sacrament. Now when it was thus turn'd from the simplicity of God's Ordinance, to be a Pompous Device of Man, (not a few of which were crept into the Church, in, yea before Cyprian's Age) it is not strange if they committed not the Managing of it to all to whom Christ had committed his Ordinances, but to one of their own Chusing. Our Debate is whether the Bishop had the sole Power of Managing any of Christ's Ordinances. (b) Now,

(b) p. 52, 53.

§ LXXXVI.

NOT to insist on his palpable Mistake concerning the Persons who were Confirmed, tho' it be certain that they were not only such as had been Baptized in their Infancy, but also many who were Instructed in the Principles of Christianity before they were Baptized. Not to insist on that, than which yet there is nothing more manifest in all the Monuments of the Third Century, (concerning a part whereof we have all this Controversy) viz. That Infants were admitted to the Lord's Supper; so that 'tis plainly Impossible that the Confirmation of such could have been that which G. R. affirms it was, viz. a Bringing of them to the Pastor, to be Tried as to their Proficiency, &c. Not to insist on G. R.'s having visibly thrown up the whole Design of his Book, by such a fair Acknowledgment as he has here made of an Officer in St. Cyprian's Time, who was one of Mens Chusing, and none of those to whom Christ committed his Ordinances; that is, in effect, a Bishop: For G. R. I am confident, will not allow him to have been either Presbyterian Minister or Presbyterian Moderator. These things, however nicking or momentous they may be, I say, I shall not insist on. All I shall require of him shall be to Instruct, from any Authentick Monument or Monuments, Canonical or Apocryphal, Scriptural or Ecclesiastical, Sacred or Profane, of the First Three Centuries, that he has here given a Full, a Fair, or a Faithful Account of Confirmation, as it Obtain'd, in any Church, in any Period of Time, in any of those Centuries: Particularly, to Instruct that Confirmation was perform'd before the Eldership, taking Eldership in his Sense, i. e. for a Presbytery, or Consistory of Church Officers, who, by Divine Institution, had Power to Govern the Church, but none at all to Preach or Administer Sacraments: Or, that there was a Time when Confirmation

was

was performed without *Imposing of the Hand* : Or, that that Rite of *Imposing of the Hand* in Confirmation, was only a *Pompous Device of Man*, after Confirmation was so much corrupted, as to be turned from the simplicity of God's Ordinance : Or, that St. Cyprian, and his Contemporaries, would have allowed it to have been called a *Device of Man*, *Pompous* or *not Pompous*, and *no Divine Ordinance*. Let G. R. I say, Instruct *All*, or but any *One* of these Things, (and to be as Easy to him as I can, I shall not say by solid Proof, but even) by so much as any one Insinuation, however faint or slender, and I do hereby promise to yield him the whole Controversy about Confirmation. But if he can perform no such thing, (and 'tis certain as Death he cannot) then I shall only leave it to the indifferent Reader to Determine with what Conscience G. R. could Chuse, so confidently to publish such *Arrant Romances*, instead of *Sincere Truths*, in a *Serious Controversy*, rather than Acknowledge himself mistaken, or suffer his Disciples to perceive the true State of Things, as they obtain'd in the purest Ages of the Primitive Churches. But this is not all, for,

2. G. R. has likewise professed not to know that which § LXXXVII. may easily be known ; namely, what St. Cyprian meant by *Imposing of the Hand*, for the *Collation of the Holy Ghost*. Take this likewise in his own words : For a further Refutation of this his Principle (my Principle, that the Bishop was the only Minister of Confirmation) it may be observed, (says he) that this Confirmation of which Cyprian here speaketh, (viz. Ep. 73.) is not that, which, in our days, goes under that Name, but that used in the Apostolick Church, the Effect of which was the giving of the Holy Ghost, as is clear from his Citing, Acts 8. 14, &c. for the Pattern of what they did, and their Warrant for it : Now that Imposition of Hands was not given to all the Baptized, but only to such as were ad Ministerium Ordinandi, saith Lightfoot : It was not ad Sanctificationem, sed ad Dona Extraordinaria, saith the same Author, Piscator, Beza, Grotius, do also so expound this place : Wherefore it proveth nothing, except our Author can tell what Cyprian meant by it, which I cannot, seeing the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost were then ceased for any thing that we know. (c) So G. R. now, how unlucky St. Cyprian was in having (c) p. 53, 54. never seen the *Elucubrations* of Lightfoot, Piscator, Beza and Grotius, on Acts 8. 14, &c. whereby he might have been

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

Taught the true meaning of that Text; or, how lucky G. R. has been in discovering that St. Cyprian, who flourish'd 1450 Years ago, could not understand, *Acts 8. 14, &c.* of *Confirmation*, because some Authors, who lived yesterday, did not so understand it, I shall leave to others to consider. Neither shall I at present Enquire, *Whether the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost had then ceased*; this may come afterwards to be considered. All I shall now attempt shall be, to help G. R. to the Knowledge of what St. Cyprian meant by *Imposing the Hand* for the Collation of the Holy Ghost. But then I am to act the part of an Historian only, not to maintain either the *Orthodoxy*, or the *Usefulness* of the *Notions* of St. Cyprian and his *Contemporaries* in this Matter; that is, G. R. must have no quarrel with me, unless it be about my *Fidelity*, or my taking their meaning right: This premised for preventing of future impertinent Disputes. I say, that

§LXXXVIII. St. CYPRIAN, as I take it, meant by it, *A Sacred Rite or Ceremony, distinct from Baptism, Instituted by Christ, and Practised by his Apostles, for giving the Holy Ghost to all Baptized Persons, and performed by Prayer, and the laying on the Hand of the Bishop.* This, I think, may pass for an Intelligible Description of the Rite, as St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries understood it. They did, indeed, Ascribe very Noble and Excellent Efficacies to Baptism. They Represent it as that which Sanctified, Quickened, Illuminated, Purged, Purified, Cleaned, Renewed, Justified all who duly Received it. They did not believe any thing more firmly, than that in Baptism, rightly Administred and Received, all former Sins were Pardoned: That its Waters were Salutory, and that by it Men did put on Christ, became Temples fit for God to dwell in, and were made agreeable Habitations for the Holy Ghost. St. Cyprian calls it the *Source of Faith*, the *Salutory Entry to the Hope of Eternal Life*, and God's *own Contrivance for Purifying and Enlivening his Servants.*

(d) Inde incipit omnis Fidei Origo, & ad Spem Vitæ æternæ Salutis ingressio, & Purificandis & Vivificandis Dei Servis Divina Dignatio. Ep. 73. p. 203.

(d) Thereby (says Firmilian) the Filth of the Old Man is wash'd off; All Sins Committed before it, are Remitted in it; It begets Sons to God by an Heavenly Regeneration; and Men

are Renewed to Eternal Life by the Sanctification of it. (e) And he thinks it very strange, that Stephen should allow Hereticks and Schismatics such a mighty Power of Grace. And yet, as I have said, nothing plainer than that they made Baptism, and the Imposing of the Hand, for giving the Holy Ghost, two distinct Rites. They were so far from making the latter an Integrant Part, or the Last or Chiefest Act, (as Salmasius (f) will have it) or an Appendage or Ceremony of the former, (as Daille will have it, (g) who cannot endure that it should be called an Integrant Part) that they made them every way as much distinct as Exorcism and Baptism, or as Baptism and the Eucharist. For,

(e) Stephanus nullo adversus Hereticos Ze- lo excitatur, Concedens il- lis non Modicam sed Maxi- mam Gratia potestatem, ut dicat eos & asseveret per Baptismi Sa- cramentum, fordes veteris hominis ablu- ere, Antiquae

Mortis peccata donare; Regeneratione Coelesti filios Dei facere, ad aeternam vitam divini Lavacri Sanctificatione reparare, &c. Ep. 75. p. 225.

(f) Appar. ad Lib. de Primatu, p. 182.

(g) De Confirmatione, p. 125, 129, 131, 132, 133, 138, 139, 150, 152, &c.

1. THEY did expressly make them two distinct Sacra- ments. Thus, I do not only take the Imposition of the Hand, for giving the Holy Ghost, to be comprehended among the [Cetera Salutaria Bona] the rest of the Salutary Ordinances, (b) and the [Cetera Ecclesiae Munera] the rest of the Offices of the Church, expressly distinguished from Baptism, by St. Cyprian, (i) and by Firmilian, (k) but also our Martyr, in express Terms, makes it a Sacrament, distinct from, and equally necessary with Baptism, for making a compleat Chri- stian. (l) So doth Nemesianus à Thuburnis: (m) Nay, we have it so called by two Councils of Bishops in two Synodical Epistles, the one written to Stephen Bishop of Rome, (n) the other to divers African Bishops. (o) You have their Testimo- nies on the Margent. But this is not all,

§ LXXXIX.
(b) Si Eccle- siae Devoti, & in Ecclesia Constituti sunt Haeretici possunt & Baptismo ejus & CETERIS SALUTARI- BUS BONIS uti. Ep. 73. p. 203.

(i) Nam si viderint (He-

retici) judicio & Sententia nostra (Catholicorum Episcoporum.) Decerni & Statui ut Baptisma justum & legitimum computetur quo illic Baptizantur, putabunt se Ecclesiam quoq; & CE- TERA ECCLESIAE MUNERA justè & legitimè possidere: Nec erit Causa veniendi ad NOS quando habentes Baptisma, habere videantur & CETERA. Ep. 73. p. 209.

(k) Qui sic Magna & Coelestia Ecclesiae MUNERA (quale est Baptisma) Haeticis conce- dit & tribuit, quid aliud quam Communicat eis quibus tantum Gratiae defendit & Vindicat? Et Frustra jam dubitat in CETERIS quoq; Consentire eis & particeps esse, &c. Ep. 75. p. 225.

(l) Baptizari eos oportet qui de Haesi ad Ecclesiam veniunt ut qui legitimo & vero atq; Unico Sanctae Ecclesiae baptismo ad regnum Dei regeneratione divina praeprantur SA- CRAMENTO UTROQUE Nascantur, quia Scriptum est, nisi quis Renatus fuerit ex AQUA & SPIRITU, non potest intrare in regnum Dei. Ep. 73. p. 207, 208.

(m) In Evangelio, divina sua voce D. N. J. C. locutus est dicens. Nisi quis Renatus fuerit ex AQUA & SPIRITU non potest introire in Regnum Dei—Neque enim SPIRITUS sine AQUA, neq; AQUA sine SPIRITU operari potest: Male ergo Quidam (*Stephanus, &c.*) sic interpretantur, ut dicant per MANUS IMPOSITIONEM Spiritum S. accipiant, & sic recipiantur, cum Manifestum sit UTROQUE SACRAMENTO debere eos renasci in Ecclesia Catholica. *Con. Carth. Suff. 5.*

(n) Eos qui sunt foris extra Ecclesiam Tincti & apud Hæreticos & Schismaticos profanæ aquæ labe Maculati, quando ad NOS atq; ad Ecclesiam quæ una est veniunt baptizari oportet, eo quod parum sit eis MANUM IMPONERE ad accipiendum Spiritum S. nisi accipiant Ecclesiæ Baptismum. Tunc enim demus PLENE SANCTIFICARI & esse Filii Dei possunt si SACRAMENTO UTROQUE Nascantur, cum Scriptum sit, nisi quis Renatus fuerit ex AQUA & SPIRITU, &c. *Ep. 72. p. 196.*

(o) Quare qui cum Domino sumus—quæcunq; Adversarii ejus & Antichristi faciunt, Repudiare & Rejicere & pro profanis habere debemus; & eis qui de errore & pravitate venientes agnoscunt unius Ecclesiæ veram fidem dare illis per OMNIA DIVINÆ GRATIÆ SACRAMENTA (non tantum per Confirmationis ritum aut Eucharistiæ administrationem, sed etiam Baptismi, ut recte adnotat Doctissimus Oxoniensis) unitatis & Fidei veritatem. *Ep. 70. p. 192.*

§ XC.

2. THEY made them *Two distinct Sacraments* founded on *distinct Institutions*. This I add, because I know it was very ordinary with St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries, very frequently to use the word *Sacrament* very Laxly. The Institution of Baptism is so known and acknowledged, that I need not insist on it. This is certain, There is not one word of *Imposing the Hand*, for the *Collation* of the *Holy Ghost*, in it. St. Cyprian, therefore, I say, and his Contemporaries, found out for it *another*, and a *distinct Institution*. In short, they Founded it thus, They found it practised by the Apostles, *Acts 8. 14, &c.* And *Cap. 19. 5, 6.* And they doubted not, but the Apostles practised it in pursuance of that Saying of our Saviours, *Except a Man be born of WATER (i. e. be Baptized) and of the SPIRIT, (i. e. have the Hand Imposed on him for the Collation of the Holy Ghost) he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, Joh. 3. 5.* as you may see by two or three of the last adduced Testimonies. They doubted not, I say, that the Apostles practised it in pursuance of this Saying of our Saviours, in which you see they understood *Baptism*, and the *Imposition of the Hand*, for giving of the *Holy Ghost*, to be *Two Sacraments* manifestly distinguished. Add to this, that they understood this of *Imposing the Hand*, &c. to have a plain Reference to, and Dependence upon our Saviour's Promise of *sending down the Holy Ghost* upon his *Disciples*, which Promise was made long after they were *Baptized*. It were easy to prove this very fully, but I shall content my self at present with three plain Testimonies:

The

The
in th
festi
thos
the C
Exor
was
It wa
many
himf
them
the T
They
for t
Prom
any v
sione
conce
Bapti
And
to, an
the H
I hav
courf
(r) an
the M

(r)
extra
Ecclesi
GRAT
werd C
tam ex
(s)
& Secu
Confit
Spiritu
mus imp
baptiza
vit den
Ep. 75

3.
pendi
stin

The first shall be that of *Vincentius à Thibari*, in his *Suffrage* in the often mention'd *Council of Carthage*, where he manifestly distinguishes *Three Steps*, whereby he would have those, who came from Heresy or Schism, to be received into the Communion of the Church. The *First* is, That they be *Exorcized*: Now, no Man, I think, will say that *Exorcism* was either *Part* or *Act*, *Appendage* or *Ceremony* of *Baptism*:

It was commonly perform'd long before *Baptism*, and a great many things *Intervene'd* between it and *Baptism*, as *Salmasius* himself acknowledges. (p) *Secondly*, (says *Vincentius*) Let them be *Regenerated* by *Baptism*; and then, after that, in the *Third* place, [*Possunt ad Pollicitationem Christi venire*] They may receive the *Imposition of the Hand* of the *Bishop*, for the *Collation of the Holy Ghost*, according to our Saviour's *Promise*.

(q) That this is his meaning, must be obvious to any who considers the state of the Controversy which occasioned the Meeting of the *Council*. That which I am chiefly concern'd for, is, That he as clearly distinguishes between *Baptism* and *Confirmation*, as between *Baptism* and *Exorcism*: And he distinguishes them by making *Confirmation* to Refer to, and Depend upon our Saviour's *Promise* of sending down the *Holy Ghost* on his *Disciples*, a *Promise* made to them (as I have said) after they were Baptized. Our Martyr also Discourses manifestly to this purpose, in his Epistle to *Jubaianus*, (r) and so doth *Firmilian*; (s) you have their own words on the Margent. Neither is this all, for,

(p) Apparatus ad Libb. de primatu, p. 185.

(q) Ergo primo per Manus Impositionem in EXORCISMO, Secundo per Baptismi Regenerationem; TUNC possunt ad Christi POLLICITATIONEM venire: alias autem fieri Censeo non debere, Suff. 37.

(r) Porro autem cum Cognoscunt Baptisma nullum foris esse, nec Remissionem peccatorum extra Ecclesiam dari posse, avidius ad Nos & promptius properant, & MUNERA ac DONA Ecclesie Matris implorant; Certi pervenire se omnino non posse ad VERAM DIVINAE GRATIAE POLLICITATIONEM (i. e. Se Spiritum Sanctum per Manus Impositionem non posse vere Consequi) nisi prius venerint ad Ecclesie Unitatem, n' per Ecclesie Baptismum, ut patet tam ex Antecedentibus quam Consequentibus. Ep. 73. p. 209.

(s) Et quoniam Stephanus & qui illi Consentiant, Contendunt dimissionem peccatorum & Secundam Nativitatem in Hæreticorum Baptismo posse procedere, apud quos etiam ipsi Consentiant Spiritum S. non esse; Considerent & intelligant Spiritalem Nativitatem sine Spiritu esse non posse (i. e. non posse quenuquam Baptizari nisi ubi Spiritus quoque Sanctus per Manus impositionem dari possit) Secundum quod & Beatus Paulus Apostolus eos qui ab Joanne baptizati fuerant, PRIUSQUAM MISSUS ESSET A DOMINO SPIRITUS S. Baptizavit denuo Spirituali Baptismo & sic MANUM IMPOSUIT ut acciperent Spiritum Sanctum. Ep. 75. p. 221.

3. THEY not only made them *distinct Sacraments*, depending upon *distinct Institutions*, but also they ascribed *distinct Effects* and *Operations* to them. According to the Current

§ XCI.

rent Principles of the Cyprianic Age, he was not a *Legitimus Christianus*, A Christian Compleat, who had received no more than *Baptism*. In those Days they believed that something *more*, plainly, *Imposition of the Hand*, was further Necessary, to make *good* his Title to all the *Priviledges* of the Christian Society. They believed there was a Material Defect even after the Person was Baptized, so long as the other Sacrament was wanting; (t) and that Persons were then, and not till then, FULLY SANCTIFIED, when they had received both Sacraments. (u) They believed that *Baptism* form'd People into *Temples*, fit for the *Holy Ghost* to inhabit; but it was by the *Imposition of the Hand*, &c. that he was *actually* Lodg'd in those *Temples*; (v) that is, (as it is explain'd in another place) *Baptism* fitted, disposed, prepared Persons for the receiving of the Holy Ghost by the Imposition of the Hand. (w) *Baptism* (as *Firmilian* resembles them) was the *Mother* that brought forth the *Child*: And the *Imposition* of the *Hand* was the *Nurse* that gave him *Suck*, and preserved his *Life*, and brought him to *Maturity*, after he was *Born*. (x) *As God did first Form Man*, (says St. Cyprian) *and then breathe in him the Breath of Life*, so *Baptism* did indeed *Form the Christian*, but it was the other Sacrament that gave him the *Holy Ghost*, to be a Living and Abiding Principle within him. (y) Nay,

(t) Baptizari eos (*Samaritanos*) ultra non oportebat; sed tantummodo quod DEERAT id à Petro & Joanne factum est, &c. Ep. 73. p. 202. Sed de hoc Testimonio fufius infra.

(u) Vide

§ 89. (n)

(v) Si effectum

Baptismi Ma-

jestati nomi-

nis tribuunt

(n' *Stephanus*,

&c.) ut qui in

Nomine Jesu

Christi ubicunq; & quomodocunq; baptizantur, innovati & Sanctificati judicentur, cur non in ejusdem Christi Nomine illic & MANUS BAPTIZATO IMPONITUR ad accipiendum Spiritum S. ? Cur eadem ejusdem Majestas nominis non prævalet MANUS IMPOSITIONE quam valuisse contendunt in Baptismi Sanctificatione ? Nam si potest quis extra Ecclesiam Natus TEMPLUM DEI Fieri (n' per Baptismum) cur non possit super TEMPLUM & SPIRITUS S. infundi ? Qui enim peccatis in Baptismo expositis Sanctificatus est, & in Novum hominem Spiritualiter Formatus, ad accipiendum SPIRITUM S. idoneus factus est. Ep. 74. p. 213. Huc etiam Spectant quæ supra observata sunt, § LXXXIII.

(w) Vide supra, § XC. (s)

(x) Non est autem una Nobiscum Hæreticorum Synagoga quia nec Sponsa est Adultera & Fornicaria; Unde nec potest Filios Deo Parere, nisi si secundum quod Stephano videtur, Hæresis quidem PARIT & exponit, Expositos autem Ecclesia Suscipit & quos non ipsa Perperit, pro suis NUTRIT cum filiorum alienorum mater esse non possit. Ep. 75. p. 224.

(y) Porro autem non per MANUS IMPOSITIONEM quis Nascitur quando accipit Spiritum S. sed in Baptismo: Ut Spiritum jam Natus accipiat, sicut in primo homine Adam factum est. Ante enim Deus eum plasmavit, & tunc insufflavit in faciem ejus flatum vitæ. Nec enim potest accipi Spiritus nisi prius fuerit qui accipiat, &c. Ep. 74. p. 213, 214.

4. BY the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*, the Gracious Operations of these Two Sacraments were so very *distinct*, that sometimes, as they thought, the *Grace* signified or communicated by the *Imposition* of the *Hand*, was given before the Administration of *Baptism*. To this purpose we have the Reasoning of a whole *Synod* of *African Bishops*, in their Epistle to *Stephen*, concerning Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms. They observe that the *Holy Ghost* (the ordinary Effect of the *Imposition* of the *Hand*) was given to *Cornelius* and his *Family*, even before they were *Baptized*: And that *St. Peter*, nevertheless, thought it *necessary* to *Baptize* them. And they affirm, that the Reason why *St. Peter* did so determine was, that he did not think that Apostles themselves could dispense with Divine Institutions; or, whatever our Lord had appointed was necessarily to be performed. You have their own words on the Margin, (z) and in them, the different Operations of *Baptism* and *Confirmation* most plainly exhibited, so very plainly, as that the greatest Efficacies of the *One*, ought not to encourage any Man to imagine that the *other* is not *necessary*. Indeed,

§ XCII.

(z) Invenimus enim etiam in Actis Apostolorum hoc esse ab Apostolis Custoditum & Salutaris fidei

dei veritate Servatum, ut cum in domo Cornelii Centurionis super ethnicos qui illic aderant fidei Calore ferventes & in Dominum toto Corde Credentes, descendisset Spiritus S. quo adimpleti variis linguis Deum benedicerent, Nihilominus tamen Beatum Apostolum Petrum Divini præcepti atq; Evangelii Memorem præcepisse ut Baptizarentur iidem illi qui jam fuerant Sancto Spiritu Pleni, ut nihil prætermisum videretur, quo minus per OMNIA Divini præcepti atq; Evangelii legem, Apostolica Magisteria Servarent. Ep. 72. p. 196.

5. *St. CYPRIAN* and his Contemporaries believed them to be two so very *distinct* Sacraments, that they allowed the *One* to be *Iterable*, but not the *other*. Neither Party, neither the *Stephanians*, nor the *Cyprianists*, allowed *Baptism* to be *Iterable*. The *Stephanians* used it as *One* of their Chief Arguments, that the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismaticks were to be reputed *Valid*, because *Baptism* could not be *Reiterated*: And the *Cyprianists* said they did not *Reiterate* Baptism, they did not *Rebaptize*, as has been already observed. (a) Hereticks and Schismaticks, according to them, did not *Baptize*: They had no Power to do it, they did not therefore *Rebaptize*, but *Baptize* those who came from Heresy or Schism. But as for the *Imposition of the Hand*, both Parties allowed it to be *Iterable*. The *Stephanians* actually required the *Reiteration* of it, at the *Reception* of those who came from

§ XCIII.

(a) Supra, § LVII.

(b) Quod nos quoque hodie observamus, ut quos Constet hic Baptizatos esse, & à Nobis ad Hæreticos transisse si post modum peccato suo Cognito & errore digesto, ad veritatem & Matricem redeat satis sit in poenitentiam MANUM IMPONERE, &c. Ep. 71. p. 194, & Ep. 74. p. 216. Observatur itaque à Nobis & tenetur F. C. explorata veritate, ut omnes qui ex quacunque Hæresi ad Ecclesiam Convertuntur, Ecclesiæ Unico legitimo baptismo Baptizentur, exceptis his qui Baptizati in Ecclesia prius fuerant, & sic ad Hæreticos transferant: hos enim oportet cum redeant, acta poenitentia per MANUS IMPOSITIONEM Solam recipi, & in Ovile unde erraverant à Pastore restitui.

(c) Stephani verba ab ipso Cypriano, Ep. 74. p. 210. Citata hæc sunt. Si quis à quacunque Hæresi venerit ad Nos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut MANUS illi IMPONATUR IN POENITENTIAM, &c.

(d) Vide hætenus Citata (b) vide etiam, Ep. 74. p. 211. ubi hæc legere est. Si ergo aut in Evangelio præcipitur aut in Apostolorum Epistolis aut Actibus Continetur, ut à quacunque Hæresi venientes non Baptizentur sed tantum MANUS illis IMPONATUR in poenitentiam; observetur divina hæc & Sancta traditio, & rursus, p. 212. plura huc facientia referre est, immo passum.

(e) Solomon denique & Saul & Ceteri multi quamdiu in viis Domini ambulaverunt, datam sibi GRATIAM tenere potuerunt: recedente ab iis disciplina Dominica, recessit & GRATIA. Ep. 13. p. 29.

— Sancta non Agentes à SPIRITU S. deferuntur. Ep. 59. p. 138.

Si vero apud insanos furor insanabilis perseveraverit & RECEDENTE SPIRITUS: quæ cepit Cacitas in sua Nocte permanferit, &c. Ep. 65. p. 163.

6. NEITHER

from Heresy or Schism. Neither was this ever Quarrelled by the *Cyprianists*. Nay, they themselves did actually Reiterate it in the Case of all those who having received Catholick Baptism turn'd Hereticks or Schismatics, and afterwards Return'd to the Unity of the Catholick Church. (b) In short, it appears to me that they understood the *Imposition* of the *Hand* for giving the *Holy Ghost*, and the *Imposition* of the *Hand* in the *Reconciliation* of *Penitents*, to have been very much of the same nature, and to the same purpose. And hence it was, that they did indiscriminately call the *Rite* of *Imposing the Hand*, *Imposition of the Hand* for the giving of the *Holy Ghost*, and *Imposition of the Hand* for *Repentance*: So *Stephen* himself calls it, (c) and so doth our *Martyr*. (d) Now no Man, I think, will deny that the *Imposition* of the *Hand* for *Repentance*, by the Principles of both *Stephanians* and *Cyprianists*, was *Reiterable*. And the Reason for which, they thought this *Imposition* of the *Hand*, for giving of the *Holy Ghost*, iterable, is very obvious in the *Cyprianic* Monuments, namely, That the *Holy Ghost*, as an *Indwelling Principle* of *Spiritual Life*, might be *Lost*; and all those *Lost* him who turn'd Hereticks or Schismatics, or *Sacrificers* to the *Heathen Deities*, &c. And therefore it was necessary, when they Repented and Returned, to *Renew* the *Imposition* of the *Hand*, that the *Holy Ghost* might be again given them. That this was a current Principle then, might be copiously proved if it were needful; to have set down two or three plain Testimonies on the Margent (e) may suffice at present.

Pr
ment
pecto
p. 16
Et
SPIR
fide
Qu
iple
propof

6
his
of t
and
that
rem
lian
from
on a
infr
mor
Age
tism
Holy
Præ
they
Bap
St.
men
Part
conf
Bap
wer
did
thus
turn
the
Gho
Dec
felf
look
cern
this

Prævaluit autem apud te contra divinam Sententiam—inimicorum & Malignorum Com-
mentum; quasi apud LAPROS & profanos & EXTRA ECCLESIAM positos, de quorum
peccatoribus EXCESSERIT SPIRITUS S. esse aliud possit nisi mens prava, &c. Ep. 66.
p. 166.

Et contra sæpe nonnulli de illis qui sani Baptizantur, si postmodum peccare Cæperint,
SPIRITU IMMUNDO REDEUNTE quatiuntur, ut manifestum sit, Diabolum in Baptismo
fide Credentis excludi, si fides postmodum defecerit, REGREDI. Ep. 69. p. 188.

Quis autem potest dare quod ipse non habeat? Aut quomodo potest Spiritualia agere, qui
ipse AMISERIT SPIRITUM SANCTUM? *Questio est à 32. Episcopis in Synodo Congregatis
proposita. Ep. 70. p. 191.*

6. NEITHER is it of any weight, that *Tertullian*, in § XCIV.
his Book about Baptism, doth straight subjoin the *Imposition*
of the *Hand*, for giving the *Holy Ghost*, to the *Baptismal Lotion*
and *Unction*. No Man can reasonably infer from thence,
that he made the *Imposition of the Hand* an *Appendage* or *Ce-*
remony of Baptism, no more than he can infer that *Tertul-*
lian made the *Eucharist* an *Appendage* or *Ceremony* of Baptism,
from his subjoining the one to the other as immediately, up-
on another occasion. (f) Such Reasonings are so apparently (f) De Resur.
infirm, that they are scarcely worth the naming. Nothing Carnis, cap. 2.
more certain, than that by the Principles of the *Cyprianic*
Age, a very long Time might have Intervene'd between *Bap-*
tism and the *Imposition of the Hand*, for the Collation of the
Holy Ghost. This was obvious to them in the *Apostolick*
Practice or Pattern, mentioned *Acts* 8, 14, &c. on which
they founded this *Sacrament*, as they call'd it. *Philip* had
Baptized the *Samaritans* a good time before *St. Peter* and
St. John Confirm'd them. And what can be a clearer Argu-
ment of any thing, than the Doctrine of *Stephen* and all his
Party is of this? Did not they Assert the *Validity*, and by
consequence, the *Perfection* of Heretical and Schismatical
Baptisms? Were they not peremptory, that such Baptisms
were so compleat, that they ought not to be Reiterated? And
did they not allow, and not only allow, but require that those,
thus compleatly Baptized in Heresy or Schism, when they re-
turn'd to the Unity of the *Catholick Church*, should have
the *Hand imposed* on them for the Collation of the *Holy*
Ghost? And might not this have been performed even some
Decads of Years after they were Baptized? Now *G. R.* him-
self cannot but know, that the *Stephanians* have always been
look'd upon as the more *Orthodox* in that Controversy con-
cerning Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms; so that, in
this Matter, we may safely Rely on their Propositions, as

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

having been then generally received : And that so much the more, that herein (I mean, in the Point presently in hand, concerning the Intervention of a long time, sometimes between *Baptism* and *Confirmation*) they are not at all contradicted by the *Cyprianists*. And yet had the *Cyprianists* been of *Daille's* mind, had they believed that the *Imposing* of the *Hand* was an *Appendage* or *Ceremony* of *Baptism*, it is scarcely to be imagined, but they would have made the *Stephanians* hear it with both Ears ; for how obvious had it been for those to have asked These, these or the like Questions : How come you to require the *Imposition* of the *Hand* on those who Return from Heresy or Schism, seeing, on the one hand, you will not allow them to be *Baptized*, and, on the other, this *Rite* of *Imposing* of the *Hand* is no *separate Sacrament*, is nothing but a *Ceremony* of *Baptism* ? Or, How come you to *Ratify* Heretical *Baptisms*, and *Repudiate* Heretical *Confirmations*, seeing the *latter* is no other than a *Ceremony* of the *former* ? Yet not one Syllable to this purpose to be found in their Writings.

§ XCV.

7. NEITHER seems it difficult to account for St. *Cyprian*, and his Contemporaries, their retaining this *Rite* of *Imposing the Hand*, for the Collation of the *Holy Ghost*, after the *Extraordinary Gifts* of the *Holy Ghost* had ceased, (if in their days they had ceased) which G. R. would fain have uncountable. For, 1. As I have already shewn, they did not found it meerly on the Apostolick Practice, mentioned *Acts* 8. 14, &c. but likewise, and principally, upon our Saviour's Promise of sending down the *Holy Ghost* on his Disciples. Now, 2. It is certain, that however, in the Beginnings of Christianity, the *Holy Ghost* wrought extraordinarily in those on whom he was conferred, yet the Promise was primarily intended for his *ordinary Operations* : Or, to give it in the Language of the Schools, when our Saviour promised to send the *Holy Ghost*, he intended to send him more principally for producing the [*Gratiæ gratum facientes*] than the [*Gratiæ gratis data.*] The latter were only necessary for the *first*, the former for *all* Ages of the Church : And G. R. himself, I hope, will grant that Mens Salvation has a far greater dependence on the former than the latter. Had *Salmasius* but minded this, I am apt to think he would not have so rashly Condemn'd the Primitive Bishops for retaining this *Rite*, as

you

you may see by his own words on the Margent (g) he has done. *Daille* did wisely consider it, and therefore he is so far from Condemning them, that he not only Excuses but even fairly Approves their Retaining of it, even after all the Extraordinary Operations of the Spirit were over; and I think G. R. must be peevish if he shall not be satisfied with this Authors words, which I have here given faithfully Transcribed on the Margent. (b)

(g) Res igitur illa tota (quæ *Act.* 8. 14, &c. *Continetur*) Extraordinaria, & Solis Apostolis Concessa, non alii cuiquam Ideo & desit cum ipsis A-

postolis, quamvis Consuetudinem Manuum imponendarum baptizatis retinuerit Primitiva Ecclesia, sed sine effectu qui Consequabatur ex impositione Manuum Apostolica; adeo ut MIMICA potius imitatio hæc sit appellanda quam Sacramentum qua & Superfedere potuerunt Præsidentes Ecclesiæ Primitivæ, immo & DEBUERUNT, &c. *Apparat. ad Libb. de Primatu, p. 181. Vide plura ejusdem Notæ, p. 138. & 187.*

(b) Cyprianus morem illum in Ecclesia ita Solemnem manus Baptizandis (rectius dixisset, *Baptizatis*) imponendi, ut etiam, qui sine hoc rite Baptizati erant, Ecclesiæ præpositis manus Impositionem Consecuturi offerrentur; Morem inquam illum repetit ab Apostolorum exemplo. Recte quidem hætenus, quod Apostolorum apud Lucam factum ostendit, & manus impositionem non profanam sed probam ac legitimam esse Cærimoniam eamq; cum Oratione super homine baptizato, sine Culpa jungi ab Ecclesiæ præpositis posse; item ut doceat Spiritus S. dona atq; incrementa ab optimo Deo ministrorum suorum precibus impetrari. Hætenus inquam apud Ecclesiam per Præpositos manum baptizatis imponentes inq; oratione sua Spiritus incrementa impetrantes id gerebatur quod ab Apostolis factum fuerat. Si vero Spiritus ipsius dona Spectes ne ipse quidem Cyprianus Negaturus fuit aliud factum ab Apostolis aliud à se & Collegis gestum. Illi enim SIGNORUM SPIRITUM conferebant, Hi vero Ordinariorum & Communium Donorum auctiorem Mensuram. *De Confirmatione, Lib. 2. Cap. 8. p. 157.*

THESE things I have Discourfed, might have been more fully insisted on; and many other things might have been mentioned for further clearing up the Principles of St. Cyprian, and his Contemporaries, concerning Confirmation. But from what I have said, methinks these things are sufficiently clear: 1. That they Believed it to be a Rite of Divine Institution. 2. A Rite to be perform'd on all Baptized Persons. 3. A Rite Distinct from Baptism, and neither part Appendage nor Ceremony of it. There is one other Argument for farther clearing this last thing; namely, That by the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, Baptism, and the Imposing of the Hand for the Collation of the Holy Ghost, were Offices so very Distinct, that they were to be perform'd by Distinct Officers. Presbyters and Deacons could Baptize, but the Imposing of the Hand, for giving the Holy Ghost, was peculiar to the Bishop. And so I am introduced to the other thing G. R. has put me to prove, viz.

§ XCVII.

2. THAT this Rite was performed by the *Bishop*. I might insist largely on this, but for brevity I shall only Repeat my former Arguments, and Vindicate them from the Exceptions G. R. has been pleas'd to make against them. They were Three Testimonies: The Testimony of St. *Cyprian*, the Testimony of *Firmilian*, and the Testimony of *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, three very Famous Authors, all three Contemporary; but tho' Contemporary, yet living at considerable distances from one another; the *First* in *Africa*, the *Second* in *Asia*, the *Third* in *Europe*. So that by very good consequence it may be said, that they Three affirming the same Thing, we have in their Testimonies the *Common Faith* as to this Point, of all the *then* Christian Churches.

§ XCVIII.

S. CYPRIAN's Testimony is in his Epistle to *Jubaianus*, where, Discourfing the Matter of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, he proposes this Objection of the *Stephanians*, "That those who were Baptized in *Samaria*, were "not Rebaptized by the Apostles, *Peter* and *John*, when "they came amongst them; They gave them only *Imposition* of the *Hand*, for the *Collation* of the *Holy Ghost*, "as we learn, *Acts* 8. 14, &c. and he returns this Answer "for substance, That that Text, *Acts* 8. 14, &c. doth not "at all make for the Objectors; for those who had been Baptized in *Samaria*, had believed with *True Faith*, and had been Baptized [*intus*] in the Communion of the Church which is *One*, and which alone has *Power* to Baptize and Remit Sins: And they had been Baptized by *One* duly qualified for performing *Valid Baptism*, namely, by *Philip* the *Deacon*, whom the very same Apostles had SENT to Baptize them. Having therefore thus Received Lawful Ecclesiastical Baptism, there was no place for any farther Baptizing of them; nothing was to be done by the Apostles, *Peter* and *John*, but that which was WANTING, viz. to give them the *Holy Ghost* by PRAYER, and THE IMPOSITION OF THE HAND: And this, says he, to this day, we do observe: Those who are Baptized in the Church are offered to the PRÆPOSITI, the Bishops of the Church, that by OUR PRAYER, and the IMPOSITION OF OUR HAND, they may receive the *Holy Ghost*, and be Consummated by the SEAL of our Lord. You have our Martyr's words on the Margent. (i)

(i) Quod autem dicunt
quidam de eis

qui in *Samaria* baptizati fuerant, advenientibus Apostolis *Petro* & *Joanne*,
NOW,

tantum super eos MANUM IMPOSITAM esse ut acciperent Spiritum S. rebaptizatos tamen non esse: Locum, *F. C.* ad præsentem Causam videmus omnino non pertinere. Illi enim qui in Samaria Crediderant; & INTUS in Ecclesia, quæ UNA est, & Cui Soli gratiam Baptismi dare & peccata Solvere permistum est à Philippo Diacono quem iidem Apostoli MISERANT, baptizati erant. Et iccirco quia Legitimum & Ecclesiasticum baptismum Consecuti fuerant, baptizari eos ultra non oportebat; sed tantummodo QUOD DEERAT, id à Petro & Joanne factum est, ut Oratione pro eis habita & manu imposita invocaretur & infunderetur super eos Spiritus Sanctus Quod nunc quoq; apud Nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesia baptizantur, PRÆPOSITIS Ecclesiæ offerantur, & per NOSTRAM ORATIONEM ac MANUS IMPOSITIONEM Spiritum Sanctum Consequantur, & SIGNACULO Dominico Consummentur. *Ep. 73. p. 201, 202.*

NOW, in this Testimony, or rather, Discourse, I affirm § XCIX. these Things to be very plain, 1. That Confirmation was a Rite distinct from Baptism, and perform'd after Baptism. 2. That it was perform'd by Prayer, and the Imposition of the Hand, for the Collation of the Holy Ghost; so that, by this time, G. R. has the greater part of the particulars contain'd in my Description of Confirmation sufficiently proved. 3. That it had been constantly in Use in the Church since the days of the Apostles. This I take to be fairly insinuated in these words, [*Quod nunc quoq; apud Nos Geritur.*] The true import whereof seems to me to be, that in Conformity to the Pattern set to them by the Apostles, the Successors of the Apostles had all along continued the Practice of this Rite; and, by the way, this seems to me such an Evidence of the constant Practice of that Rite ever since the Apostles times, as is too weighty for all the Conjectures and little Semblances of Reason insisted on by *Daille*, &c. for proving that it did not come in Use till towards the End of the Second Century; and when put in the Ballance with them, will make them all appear to be Light. And then, 4. In the foregoing Discourse of *St. Cyprian*, we have that which is our main Concern at present, namely, That the Rite of Confirmation was perform'd by the Bishops: They were the Men who Ordinarily and Regularly Conferred the Holy Ghost by Prayer, and the Imposition of the Hand; and so, every part of my Description of it is Confirmed.

NOT so, says G. R. Why? Because those who perform'd the Rite are only called PRÆPOSITI; and Presbyters were called by that Name. (k) I grant they were so, and so were (l) § XXXIX. Deacons, as I have already proved. (l) But then I have like- P. 53. wise proved, to a Demonstration, that Bishops, as such, Bi- (l) Above, § XXVIII. shops as Superiour to Presbyters, Bishops as the Chief Governours

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

(m) Supra,
§ XXVIII, &c.

vernours of Churches, had this Name most frequently bestowed upon them. (m) And nothing can be plainer, from the whole Train of our Martyr's Discourse here, than that the PRÆPOSITI he meant were the Bishops. This is necessary, 1. From the plain Analogy of his Discourse. He tells us expressly, that he gives us the Churches Practice as exactly agreeing with the Apostolick Pattern: By consequence, nothing plainer than that, as those who in the Apostles Times had Power to Baptize, (as Philip had, who Baptized the Samaritans) had not, withal, Power to Confirm, that being a proper Ministry, peculiarly Reserved to the Apostles, and perform'd by them; so it was in his Time: However others, besides Bishops, did Baptize, yet when the Baptized Person was to be Confirmed, he was brought to those PRÆPOSITI who succeeded to the Apostles in the Ecclesiastical Sovereignty, which I have already fully proved Bishops were believed to do. (n) Nay, without allowing the PRÆPOSITI here mention'd to have been the Bishops, as Contradistinguished from all other Clergy men, G. R. shall never be able to make sense of St. Cyprian's Discourse; for our Martyr tells us manifestly, That it was after Persons were Baptized, that they were brought to the PRÆPOSITI to be Confirmed, which must needs import that the Minister of Baptism was One, as indeed he was, sometimes a Presbyter, and sometimes a Deacon, and the Minister of Confirmation was another. But what needs more? Let us, 3. Consider these words of our Martyr's, Those, says he, who are Baptized in the Church, are brought, or offered to the PRÆPOSITI, [ut per NOSTRAM ORATIONEM ac MANUS IMPOSITIONEM Spiritum S. Consequantur] that by OUR PRAYER, and the Imposition of OUR HAND, they may receive the Holy Ghost, &c. What can be more manifest, than that the Pronoun [Nostram] OUR, determines the Præpositi, who were the Ministers of Confirmation, to have been such as he himself was, that is, Bishops, and Bishops only? Indeed, the Evidences contain'd in this our Martyr's Discourse, of their being the Bishops who are here called the Præpositi, are so very bright and irresistible, that they have Extorted a plain Confession of it from both Blondel and Salmasius.

(n) Supra,
§ II, &c.

§ CI.

BLONDEL, I say, roundly, Confesses that by his Præpositi, here, St. Cyprian meant the Bishops: And he confesses it with these Resentments of it, That this Ministry was appropriated

prop
whic
that
tizin
Rule
was
tury
Præ
titul
ackn
Tim
Tim
tion.
for
num
of I
by w
but
of
mat
Per
with

Cen
Nem
invit
xeiz
fint
Confe
Eccle

non
COR
cum
p. 18

M
Mi
par
Ba
Tel
Ple
litt
the

propriated to the Bishops by the Exigencies of a Discipline which was Introduced after the days of the Apostles : By that Discipline whereby Presbyters were bound up from *Baptizing without the Bishops Allowance* ; that is, plainly, by the Rules of *Episcopal Government*, which, he all along contends, was not Introduced till about the middle of the Second Century : And he acknowledges that St. Cyprian meant the same *Præpositi*, whom (150 Years after St. Cyprian) St. Austin Entitled to this *Ministry*. (o) And I hope G. R. himself, who acknowledges that *Episcopacy was past its Meridian in Austin's Time*, (p) will not make scruple to acknowledge that in his Time, Bishops were the *only ordinary Ministers of Confirmation*. *Salmasius's* Confession is every whit as plain as *Blondels*, for having cited these very words of our Martyr's, [*Quod nunc quoq; apud Nos Geritur, &c.*] he adds, That this Rite of Imposing the Hand was the *last and chief Act of Baptism*, by which it was believed to be Consummated and Perfected, but not Confirmed : And that this was NEW, in that last Act of Baptism, that BISHOPS ONLY could give that Consummation : And therefore, if the Bishop was present, when any Person was Baptized, the Rite of Imposing the Hand was forthwith performed ; but if he was absent, it was delayed. (q)

(o) Cum omnem (ex induta post Apostolos disciplina) Ecclesia Actum per Episcopos PRÆPOSITOS Gubernari Solitum fuisse totidem verbis Monuerit Cyprianus ; ut Baptismum quem ex aquo ab omnibus exerceri & dari posse

Censuit Tertullianus, sine Episcopi Auctoritate dandi Presbyteri & Diaconi jus Non haberent, Nemini mirum fuerit si adscito à priscis Manum baptizandis per Benedictionem advocantem & invitamentum Spiritum Sanctum imponendi ritu, adjunctoq; eadem libertate Spiritus quem Joannes Xristus ipse rē dñs vocavit Chrismatis Materialis sensibili Symbolo, Præpositis Ecclesie oblatis sint Cypriani ætate Baptizati, ut per eorum orationem & manus impositionem Spiritum Sanctum Consequerentur, eundemq; Morem in suis Præpositis, annis etiam post Cypriani Martyrium 150 Ecclesiam Servare scripserit Augustinus. *Apol. pro sent. Hieron. p. 209.*

(p) Vide supra, Cap. V. § III.

(q) —Ultimus erat ac Summus baptismi Actus quo & Consummari credebatur ac perfici, non vero Confirmari. Hoc etiam NOVUM fuit in isto ultimo actu Baptismi, ut SOLI EPISCOPI eam Consummationem tradere possent. Ideo si præsens esset EPISCOPUS, statim cum ipso Baptismo Conferebatur, si abesset, Differebatur. *Apparat. ad Libb. de Primatu, p. 182.*

NEITHER, indeed, doth *Daille* himself deny, that this Ministry was peculiar to the Bishop, at least in some Cases, particularly if the Bishop was present when any Person was Baptized. He labours, indeed, to obscure our Martyr's Testimony as much as he can : He comes in with G. R's Plea, viz. That Presbyters were also called [*Præpositi*,] but little, I think, for G. R's behoof, for he expressly makes them *Præpositi* in a Station and Order inferior to that of Bishops.

§ CII

(r) Is (Præpositorum) titulus tam Presbyterorum quam Episcoporum communis erat, qui utriq; sed SUO singuli LOCO atq; ORDINE Ecclesiæ præerant, ejusq; Præpositi erant. De

Confirm. p. 154

(s) Qui à Presbyteris in Ecclesia, cum adesset Episcopus, baptizati erant, ii, honoris causa, MANUS IMPOSITIONEM ab EPISCOPO, ultimum accepisse, postquam cætera à Presbytero habuissent, videntur. *Ibid.* 155.

§ CIII.

THUS I think I have sufficiently Vindicated our Martyr's Testimony, and made it evident that, if we may rely on his Authority concerning a *Matter of Fact*, current every day, in his own time, *Bishops* were the *Ministers* of *Confirmation*. But before I leave this Testimony, I think I may adventure to draw out of it a new Argument, in Confirmation of the Bishops *Sovereign Power* in *Baptism*; for he who duly weighs the Testimony, will find that the Foot on which St. Cyprian Establishes the *Validity* of the *Baptisms*, perform'd by Philip in *Samaria*, is not simply that they were perform'd by him; nay, nor that they were perform'd by him in the *Unity* of the *Church*, but that they were perform'd by him as being SENT by the *Apostles* to *Baptize* those *Samaritans*, exactly according to *Tertullian's* Testimony, and before him *Ignatius's*; without doubt most exactly according to the Current Principles which obtain'd in the Days of St. Cyprian, viz. That Baptisms could not be Regularly perform'd but in Dependence on the Bishop, *Non sine Episcopi auctoritate*, not without his License, his Allowance, his Authority. And so much concerning St. Cyprian's Testimony.

§ CIV.

FIRMILIAN's Testimony which I adduced, was that known one mentioned before more than once, viz. That all Power and Grace is to be found only in the Church where those Elders preside who possess the Power of Baptizing, Imposing the Hand, and Ordaining. For as an Heretick cannot Ordain

nor

nor Impose the Hand, so neither can he Baptize. (t) This Ci-
 tation, says G. R. destroyeth what it is brought for : (u) Why ?
 Because he hopes, forsooth, I will not say that Presbyters had
 no Power in Baptism. I do not say it : I do not think they
 had no Power in Baptism. But I do sincerely think, and will
 boldly say, That by the Principles of those Times, Presby-
 ters had only a Subordinate, a Dependent, an Accountable,
 not at all a Supreme, an Independent, a Sovereign Power in
 Baptism. I am apt to think G. R. might very readily have
 judged that this I would say, and therefore I cannot under-
 stand how he came to say what he instantly subjoins : Where-
 fore (says he) by Bishops here, Firmilian must mean the Pastors
 of the Church ; all of whom were frequently called Bishops at
 that time. I cannot understand, I say, what could move
 G. R. to advance such a sorry consequence : For what conse-
 quence can be sorrier than this, Presbyters have a subordinate
 dependent, accountable Power in Baptism ? Ergo, Firmilian
 must mean Presbyters, when he speaks of those who presided
 in the Church, and as presiding in it, had the Power of Bap-
 tism, Confirmation and Ordination. And yet this is not all,
 the Consequence is not sorrier than the Position with which
 it is back'd is false ; namely, That all Presbyters were fre-
 quently called Bishops at that time : A Position as false as any
 can be concerning a Matter of Fact in any Period of Time,
 A Position as False as any can be concerning a Matter of Fact
 in any Period of Time, i. e. A Position that has the whole
 Stream of the Monuments of that Time against it ; and not
 so much as a shadow of a single Syllable in any of those Mo-
 numents for it. But the main Exception follows ; which
 is,

(t) Omnis
 Gratia & po-
 testas in Ec-
 clesia consti-
 tuta est, ubi
 Præsident Ma-
 jores Natu,
 qui & Bapti-
 zandi & Ma-
 num impo-
 nendi & Or-
 dinandi possi-
 dent potesta-
 tem. Hære-
 tico enim si-
 cut Ordinare
 non licet, nec
 Manum impo-
 nere, ita nec
 Baptizare. Ep.
 75. p. 221.
 (u) p. 54.

THAT I confess that those spoken of by Firmilian, were
 only called by him [Majores Natu,] and therefore I have most
 Absurdly pleaded, that they were Bishops as distinct from
 Preaching Presbyters. (v) Nothing less than most Absurdly ! (v) p. 54.
 I should have had reason to be sorry if I had given G. R. just
 Cause to be Angry. But to the Point : I did, indeed, con-
 fess, (and G. R. might have acknowledged my Ingenuity in
 it) that the Term which I Translated [Bishops] is [Majores
 Natu,] I do now farther confess, that it is very possible that
 the Term, which Firmilian (who wrote in Greek) used, was
 Πρεσβυτεροι. I say, very possible. But then I say likewise,
 that it will be hard for G. R. to prove certainly that that was

§ CV.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

the Term. But whatever it was, G. R. may remember that I added these words, which he has most cunningly concealed, because, to have brought them above-board, had stifled all his little Exceptions. I added these words, I say, *But that he (Firmilian) meant Bishops, as distinguished from Presbyters, cannot be called in question by any Man who reads the whole Epistle, and considers his Style all along, and withal considers what a peculiar Interest, by the Principles of those Times, the Bishop had in those Three Acts he Names.* These words I added, and I do not yet Repent that I added them; G. R. may afterward have Occasion to consider the Reasons of this

(w) Cap. VII.
§ XIX. &c.
& Cap. X.
§ XXXIV,
&c.
(x) p. 38, &c.

my Confidence. (w) At present I think it enough to tell him, that in the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, (x) I gave such Arguments for the Bishops having the Power of Ordination, in that Age, as he has not Answered, as he shall never be able to Answer: And as for *Baptism*, the Candid Reader may competently Judge, whether the *Sovereign Power* of it belong'd to the Bishop, by the Arguments I have here adduced for it: And I hope G. R. will not be so obstinate as to say that *Firmilian*, tho' he meant that they were the *Bishops* who had the *Sovereign Power* of Ordination and *Baptism*, yet did not allow them the *Sovereign Power* of Confirmation. And so much briefly concerning the Testimony of *Firmilian*.

§ CVI.

(y) Lib. 6.
Cap. 43.

(z) p. 54.

THE *Third Testimony* I adduced was that of *Cornelius* Bishop of Rome, in an Epistle to *Fabius* Bishop of Antioch, Recorded by *Eusebius*. (y) For there *Cornelius* insists on it as a good Argument of *Novatianus* his unfitness for being a Bishop, *that tho' he was Baptized, yet he was not Confirm'd by the Bishop.* To this G. R. has return'd two things as surprising as any in all his Book. First, He says, *It is of little weight which Cornelius says of Novatianus, viz. That he was not Confirm'd by the Bishop.* (z) Why? Because, forsooth, *Cornelius in that place question'd not only the Confirmation of Novatianus, but his Baptism.* This, I say, is surprising, for, 1. It is notoriously false that *Cornelius* question'd the *Baptism* of *Novatianus*: And then, 2. Admitting that he had question'd his *Baptism*, yet what a singular way of Reasoning is this, *Cornelius* question'd *Novatianus's* Baptism, therefore it is of little weight that he pleaded his *Incapacity* to be a Bishop, from his *not being Confirm'd* by a Bishop? Is it of little weight that one is Charg'd with *Schism*, because he is also Charg'd with *Heresy*? Is it of little weight that

one

one is Accused of *Rebellion*, because he is also Accused of *Perjury*? Is it of little weight that one is Affirmed to be *Impudent*, because he is also Affirmed to be *Ignorant*? Is it of little weight that one's *Charity* is Questioned, because his *Chastity* is also called in Question? Is this current Logick in a certain *College*, that it is of little weight that *One* is Incapable of such or such an Office, upon *one* Account, because he is also said to be Incapable of it upon *another*?

IT is every whit as surprizing, which G. R. says in the § CVII. *second place*, viz. That *Cornelius* spake not of the *Ordinary Confirmation*, but that which belong'd to *Priests*. This is clear, (continues he) for *Cornelius* saith, *How then came he by the Holy Ghost?* And he is there pleading his Incapacity to be a *Bishop* on that Account. Clear! says G. R. Certainly He and I do not stand in the same *Light*; for to me, what he has here said, is either *Pure Mystery* or *Pure Mistake*. I confess it has most of the *Natural Features* of *Pure Mystery*. *Cornelius* speaketh not of the *Ordinary Confirmation*, but of that which belong'd to the *Priests*. In the Name of Common Sense, pray tell me, what is that *Extraordinary Confirmation* which belongeth to *Priests*, and to *no other body*? And what for a *Proof* of that *Extraordinary Confirmation*, which belonged *only* to *Priests*, is this, that *Cornelius* saith of *Novatianus*, *How then came he by the Holy Ghost?* I thought I had proved, above, to a *Demonstration*, that it was the Common Belief of those Times, that the Holy Ghost was Conferred on all Persons duly Baptized, by the *Ordinary Confirmation*. How Cunning is G. R. when it makes for his purpose? He knows not (not he indeed) what *Cyprian* meant by *Imposing the Hand* for the *Collation* of the *Holy Ghost*; and yet, when it makes for his purpose, within 12 or 14 lines, he is so profound in the Knowledge of *Confirmation*, as that he has discovered a *certain sort* of *Extraordinary Confirmation*, peculiar to *Priests*, which never Man, for any thing I know, discovered before him. But, perhaps, however he worded it, his meaning was, that *Cornelius* speaketh not of the *Ordinary Imposition* of the *Hand*, but of that which belongeth to *Priests*. Well! say he meant this; say that, thus meant, clear Sense may be made of it: Say that, thus understood, it has no *Dash* of *Mystery* in it; yet how will you Absolve it from being *Muddy Phrase*? Had it not been every whit as easy, and much more Intelligible, to have said that *Cornelius*

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

did not speak of the *Imposition* of the *Hand* in *Confirmation*, but of the *Imposition* of the *Hand* in *Ordination*? But then, if this was that which G. R. meant, it is *Pure Mistake*: For, nothing more evident in the Account, as *Eusebius* has it, (and it is only from him we have it) than that *Cornelius* did notoriously distinguish this *Confirmation*, which *Novatianus* had not got from the *Bishop*, from both his *Ordinations*, that which made him a *Presbyter*, and that by which he pretended to have been made a *Bishop*: And I think G. R. will find it no Easy Matter (I mean he will find it impossible) to prove, that in the days of *Cornelius*, there were others deem'd *Priests*, besides *Bishops* and *Presbyters*. That *Cornelius* did notoriously make the distinction I have mentioned; and that his words, on which I founded my Argument, for the *Bishop's* being the *Minister* of *Confirmation* in his Time, will not allow of G. R.'s Gloss, are things so clear and plain, and evident in *Eusebius's* Account of his Epistle, according to both *Stephanus's* and *Valesius's* Editions of *Eusebius's* Ecclesiastical History in *Greek*, (I cannot say so much of *Meredith Hanmer's* English Translation, for I do not pretend to be of its acquaintance) that they must be obvious to every intelligent Reader, and therefore I shall insist no more on them. Only let me farther tell G. R. that his Three Learnedest Friends, *Blondel*, *Salmasius* and *Daille*, are every inch as much against him, as to this Testimony of *Cornelius*, as they were before concerning *St. Cyprian's*.

§ CVIII.

BLONDEL most readily understands it of *Confirmation*, and makes no question of its being one of the *Bishops Ministeries*: All his business is to maintain, that it was not absolutely necessary, and that *Presbyters* were not Restrained from the Performance of it by any Divine Law, but only by Ecclesiastical Canon or Custom. His Account of this Testimony, in short, is this: "About the Year 240, *Novatianus* (being baptized on his Sick-bed) recovering of his Sickness, did not get the rest of those things which were necessary by the *Canons of the Church*; particularly, he was not *Confirmed* by the *Bishop*, however, very shortly thereafter, *Fabianus*, Bishop of Rome, Ordain'd him a *Presbyter*."

(a) Anno circiter 240.

ἡ δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν

ἐπιτελεσθῆναι

τῶν ἱερῶν ὧν χρὴ

μεταλαμβάνειν

καὶ τὴν τῆς

ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὴν

ἐκκλησιαστικὴν

ἐκκλησιαστικὴν

ἐκκλησιαστικὴν

ἐκκλησιαστικὴν

ἐκκλησιαστικὴν

ἐκκλησιαστικὴν

ἐκκλησιαστικὴν

ἐκκλησιαστικὴν

ἐκκλησιαστικὴν

ἐκκλησιαστικὴν

(a) So *Blondel*, not only fairly allowing *Cornelius* to have meant that Rite which we call *Confirmation*, but also Oppo-

caetera postquam Morbo effugit quæ juxta Ecclesiæ Regulam Suscipere oportet, nec ut ab

sing

Episcopo Consignaretur adeptus est Novatianus, quem tamen Paulo post ad Presbyterium promovit Fabianus Urbis Papa. *Apol. pro sent. Hieron. p. 210.*

sing G. R. upon another Account: For *Blondel*, you see, says that *Novatianus* was Ordain'd a *Presbyter* by *Fabianus* the Pope of the City, very shortly after his *Baptism*, but it is certain that *Novatianus* was not Ordain'd pretended Bishop of Rome till more than a Year after the Death of *Fabianus*; so that he had been at least nine or ten Years (as I remember *Blondel* himself calculates it somewhere) a *Presbyter*, before he pretended to have been made a Bishop. Now, I hope, G. R. will not deny, that when *Novatianus* was made a *Presbyter*, it was by Ordination that he was made One: And, on the other hand, nothing more evident in *Cornelius's* Accounts to *Fabius* of *Antioch*, than that the same *Novatianus*, when he invaded the *Episcopal Chair* of Rome, received a new Imposition of Hands, a new Ordination. Nothing more certain therefore, than that by the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, Bishops and Presbyters were (even by *Blondel's* Allowance) made by different Ordinations, and so made different Orders. But this only by the way.

SALMASIUS manifestly distinguishes between the Imposition of Hands in Ordination and in Confirmation; and for an instance of the latter, he adduces the very words of *Cornelius* concerning *Novatianus*, and never so much as once offers to question its being a Ministry, in those Times, peculiar to the Bishop. Indeed, how could he, considering his Concessions concerning *St. Cyprian's* Testimony which we have adduced before? You have his words concerning this Testimony of *Cornelius* on the Margent. (b)

(b) Manuum autem Impos-

sitio quæ fiebat ad Ordinationem etiam Consignatio dicebatur—Hoc idem faciebant in Sacramento Confirmationis quæ olim sola Manuum impositione celebrabatur sine Chrismate. Unde & Σχεμαδῆται absolutæ Confirmationis Sacramentum accipere per Impositionem Manuum, apud Eusebium, qui *Cornelii* Papæ de *Novatiani* Baptismo verba refert ad *Fabium* Antiochenum, Νίσω περιπίσων χειρὶν ἐ, ὅσον εἰς πᾶσι δωρενδεῖσθαι τομίζομεν. ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίσσῃ ἡ εὐχὴ, σφραγισθεῖς, ἔλαβι, ἐν τῇ χερὶ λῆξαν ὅτι πιστὸν εἰληπέναι καὶ ὅτι λατῶν ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τὴν εὐσυναν χερὶ μεταλαμβάνειν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κἀνὸν, τὸ σφραγισθῆναι ὑπὸ τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ τὰς δὲ μὴ πρῶτον, πὸς αὐτὸν τὸ εἶναι πνεύματι. ἐν τῇ—Quæ non solum de Chrismatione possunt accipi, sed etiam de Manuum impositione. *Apparat. p. 83.*

DAILLE is a great deal Franker concerning this Testimony of *Cornelius*, than he was concerning *St. Cyprian's*, he mentions it oftner than once, and he always understands

it

it of *Confirmation*, and always grants (when he mentions this Testimony) that, by the *Customs* of those Times, the *performance* of it was an *Episcopal Ministration*, as you may see by what is faithfully transcribed from him on the Margent. (c) 'Tis true, he has some Reasonings concerning *Confirmation*, taken from *Cornelius's* Account of the *Baptism* of *Novatianus*, and his not being *Confirmed*, which I cannot so easily digest: Particularly, from *Fabianus* his Ordaining *Novatianus* a *Presbyter*, tho' he was not *Confirmed*, he would gladly Collect that the *Imposition* of the *Hand*, in *Confirmation*, was only a *Ceremony* of *Baptism*, and therefore *Novatianus*, not having got it when he was Baptized, *Fabianus* did not think it proper or allowable to give it him afterward; which yet he might have freely done, nay, might in *Prudence* have been obliged to do, if it had been a *Rite distinct* from *Baptism*, and none of the *Appendages* or *Ceremonies* of it: So *Daille* Reasons, I say, (d) but, to my apprehension, very weakly, for I have shewn above, (c) most evidently, that by the Principles of those Times, the *Rite* of *Imposing* the *Hand*, for the *Collation* of the *Holy Ghost*, might have been performed a long time, many Years, after *Baptism*; so that, it is certain, that which *Daille* founds his Argument on, was not the true Reason for which *Fabianus* did not Confirm *Novatianus* before he Ordain'd him a *Presbyter*. But this being something like digression from our present purpose, I shall at present insist no longer on it; it is enough for what we have now in hand, that *Daille* all along understands *Cornelius* of *Confirmation*, and grants that in *Cornelius's* Time it was a *Ministry* belonging to the *Bishop*, for which I do again recommend to G. R. *Daille's* own words cited on the Margent.

(c) Cornelius
Urbis Romæ
Episcopus qui
post Tertul-
liani mortem
annis non am-
plius quam 33
floruit, de
CONSIGNA-
TIONE
EPISCOPALI
& cæteris Bap-
tismi ritibus
loquens
ἐν χρί (inquit)
μεταλαμβάνειν
τὴν τῆς ἐκ-
κλησίας χάριν α--
Non ergo
Apostoli, sed
Ecclesiæ, hunc
Morem, ut &
alios Conge-
neres posue-
rant. De Con-
firm. Lib. 2.
Cap. 2. p. 118.
Videntur quem-
admodum Con-
signationem
Episcopalem
inter istius
ævi Mores
Ecclesiasticos,
libenter agnos-

cat? Et infra, ejusdem Libri Cap. 7. ubi de hac Cornelii Romani ad Fabium Antiochenum Relatione, ex professo tractat, Cornelii verbis fusè fideliterq; prolatis; Consignationeq; hac Episcopali, qua caruisse Novatianum affirmat Cornelius, conceptis verbis, ab ea, quæ in Ordinatione dabatur, Manuum impositione, distinctâ; hisce verbis sui animi sensa promit *Dalleus*, p. 139. Ego vero fateor illa τὰ λοιπὰ, cætera post baptismum Solennia quibus caruit Novatianus intelligi lactis & Mellis prægustationem, & alias, si quæ tum erant in Ecclesiæ Romanæ usu Baptismales Cerimonias; quibus cum hic à Cornelio LIQUIDO accenseatur, τὸ σερραγιδίον ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως, OBSIGNARI ab EPISCOPO, &c. & p. 141. Non inepte possunt hæc Cornelii verba [πὸς αὐτὸν τὸ ἀγίον πνεῦμα τὸ ἐν ἑστέ?] in Commodiorem Sensum inflecti; si quod ait [Spiritus Sanctum accipere] id pro ipsa Manus impositione, quæ Spiritus Sancti Symbolica erat Advocatio, dictum interpretetur: qualiter non semel dictum à veteribus [Spiritus Sanctum tradere] pro manus imponere. Sic enim planus & verus erit Cornelii Sensus, Qui

THUS

scilicet non esset ab EPISCOPO CONSIGNATUS, eum non posse (i. e. non licere EX SOLEMNI TUNC RECEPTOQUE ECCLESIAE MORE) manus impositionem (ut vel Presbyter vel Episcopus fieret) suscipere. (e) § XCIV.

THUS I have briefly explained what St. Cyprian, and § CXI. his Contemporaries, meant by the *Imposition of the Hand*, for the *Collation* of the *Holy Ghost*; and shewn, that the *Mystery* of the *Rite*, by the Principles of that Age, was *peculiar* to the Bishop. I might have pursued both Points more fully, especially the last, for which I was mainly concern'd; perhaps more Testimonies might have been adduced for it, and divers other Arguments might have been insisted on. Particularly, (to Name one or two) what more evident in the Monuments of that Age, than that it belong'd to him who had the *Chief Power* of *Reconciling Penitents*, and granting the *Peace* and the *Communion* of the *Church*, to any who were *out* of it, than that it belong'd to that Person, I say, to *Impose* the *Hand* for giving the *Holy Ghost*? And what more evident in those Monuments, (as we shall see hereafter) (f) than that they were the Bishops who had the *Chief Power* of Granting *Peace* and *Communion*, and *Reconciling Penitents*? (f) Chap. VII. Again, Have I not shewn that those, who lived in the *Cyprianic Age*, believed the *Rite* of *Imposing the Hand* to be a *Sacrament* by it self, and *Contradistinct* from *Baptism*? And have I not sufficiently proved, in my former Book, that by the Principles of that Age, the Bishop had the *Supreme Power* of the *Sacraments*? Have I not more than sufficiently proved this, in this Chapter, concerning the *Sacrament* of *Baptism*? And is it probable that G. R. shall be able to shew me a Reason, why the Common Principles of the Men of the *Cyprianic Age*, should have obliged them to appropriate the *Supreme Power* of *other Sacraments*, but *not* of *Confirmation* to the Bishop? Let not G. R. imagine he has here got me in a *Circle*; that is, proving, *first*, that the Bishop had the *Supreme Power* of *Baptism*, from his having the *Supreme Power* of *Confirmation*: And *then*, proving that he had the *Supreme Power* of *Confirmation* from his having the *Supreme Power* of *Baptism*. For if he shall be at pains to consider what I have discours'd on this 13th *Episcopal Prerogative*, he may readily find that I have used a good many more Arguments, for demonstrating the Bishops *Sovereign Power* in *Baptism*, than that *One* of his having the *Sovereign Power* of *Confirmation*. This I have thought fit to warn him of, for preventing

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

preventing of impertinent Jangling and Nibbling, which some People are too much inclin'd to. The force of these two above-mentioned Reasonings, might have been more fully represented, and divers other such Reasonings might easily be insisted on, but the Point is clear enough already: Indeed it is not Questioned, for any thing I know, by any Man who has any Title to the Characters of being both Learned and Ingenuous: And we have had enough about *Confirmation*: And enough (I think by this time) of the clear Evidences, for the Bishops *Sovereign Power in Baptism*, which may be Collected from the Arguments insisted on by the Advocates on both sides, in their Management of the Grand Controversy, agitated in the *Cyprianic Age*, concerning the *Validity of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*. Proceed we therefore,

§ CXII.

THIRDLY, in a few words, to shew how the Bishops *Sovereign Power in Baptism* is most distinctly, I may say, most demonstratively pointed out by both *Stephanians* and *Cyprianists*, in one of the most remarkable *Results* of the Controversy; that is, in their Behaviour one towards another, and the Resentments which followed upon their thus Dissenting one from another. In short, *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* Excommunicated those who *Opposed the Ratification of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*; and now, who were they whom he Excommunicated? Were they *Presbyters* or *Deacons*? All Officers, who by the Principles of that Age could actually Administer the Holy Ordinance of *Baptism*? Were those the Men, I say, against whom he did immediately and directly thunder out his Curses? Nothing like it. They were the Bishops whom he Excommunicated: The Bishops, I say, as those who had it in their Power to Ratify such Baptisms but would not: And *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, only in Consequence and Result; only in so far as they adhered to their *Bishops* who dissented from him. This we are most distinctly taught, by three Persons of as great Reputation as were then alive, *Firmilian* Bishop of *Cesarea* in *Capadocia*, (g) *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, (h) and our Holy Martyr *St. Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*, (i) as is evident from their Testimonies on the Margent. On the other hand,

(g) *Beati Pauli verbis, Eph. 4. 1, 2, 3, 4. 5. in Medium adductis, sic Subnectit Firmilianus.*

Hæc Apostoli Mandata & Monita Salutaria quam diligenter Stephanus implevit.

Quid enim Humilius aut lenius quam cum tot EPISCOPIS per totum Mundum dissentisse; PACEM cum Singulis vario discordiæ genere rumpentem modo cum Orientalibus (quod nec vos latere Confidimus) modo vobiscum qui in Meridie estis? A quibus Legatos EPISCOPOS patienter satis & leniter suscepit, ut eos nec ad Sermonem Saltem Colloquii Communis admitteret: adhuc insuper dilectionis & Caritatis Memor, præciperet fraternitati Univerſa, nequis eos in domum suam reciperet, ut venientibus non Solum PAX & COMMUNIO, sed & testum & hospitium Negaretur. Ep. 75. p. 228.

(b) Ἐπεπελάκει μὲν ἔν περὶ τὴν κ' καὶ ἑλὲν καὶ περὶ Φιρμιλιανῶν, καὶ πάντων τ' τε ἀπὸ τ' Κιλικίας καὶ κατὰ παρθενίας καὶ διανοίᾳ Γαλατίας, πάντων τ' ὁμορρόπων ἰθὺν ὡς εἰδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινονήσαν δια τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν, &c. apud Euseb. Lib. 7. Cap. 5. In short, Dionysius says that Stephen Excommunicated Helenus Bishop of Tarsus, and Firmilian Bishop of Caesarea, and all the Bishops of Cilicia and Cappadocia, and Galatia, and all the Neighbouring Countries, for this very reason, that they Rebaptized Hereticks; and he calls it a bold act, at best, to have done so, considering how many Synods of BISHOPS were against the Ratification of Heretical Baptisms. His words are, καὶ σέπει τὸ μέγιστον τὴν πράγματι, ὅπως γὰρ ἀόγκματα γέγονεν ἐν τ' μερίσιν τ' ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ συνόδοις, ὡς πυνθάνομαι, ὥστε τὴν περιστάσαν ἀπὸ αἰρέσεως, περιεπαρθενίας, ἵστα ἀπολέσθαι καὶ ἀποκηρύσσονται τὴν τ' παλαιὰ καὶ ἀκαθάρτα ζύμη ῥύπον.

(i) Dat honorem Deo qui Hæreticorum amicus, & inimicus Christianorum SACERDOTES DEI (i.e. Episcopus) veritatem Christi & Ecclesiæ Unitatem tuentes ABSTINENDOS putat? Si sic Honor Deo datur, si sic à Cultoribus & SACERDOTIBUS ejus timor Dei & Disciplina Servatur; abjiciamus arma, &c. Ep. 74. p. 214. quæ verba in Stephanum Episcopos abstinentem torqueri ex totius Epistolæ filo manifestum est.

St. CYPRIAN, tho' never more zealous in any Cause § CXIII. than this, tho' perfectly perswaded that he, and those who sided with him, were in the right, and Stephen, and his Adherents, were in the wrong: Tho' so fully perswaded, as that he made no Scruple to load the Doctrine of his Adversaries with very unpleasant Consequences, and even themselves with pretty hard Names, as you may see by the instances on the Margent, (k) and none more than Stephen, tho' (k) Illud Mirandum est, he was Bishop of Rome, as we may see hereafter. (l) Yet he could not think on Breaking Peace with them, of giving up imo Indignandum potius & Communion with them, of Abstaining, or Excommunicating Dolendum Christianos them. Now, would you know who those his Adversaries Antichristis were, with whom he was willing to live in Peace, and entertain Communion, notwithstanding of their dissenting from assistere & him, and opposing him in a Matter which seem'd to him of Prævaricatores fidei atq; Ecclesiæ Pro- so great Consequence? Read and Examine all the Epistles he ditores intra ipse septa Ec- wrote about this Controversy, and you shall always find they clesiæ contra Ecclesiam sta- were his Collegues the Bishops. Nay, more than once he says, re, Ep. 69. p. in most plain and exprels Terms, that he will not break

185.—Nescio qua Prasumptione ducuntur quidam de COLLEGIS Nostris ut putent eos qui apud Hæreticos Tincti sunt quando ad Nos venerint, baptizari non oportere.—Ep. 71. p. 193.—Porro autem quidam de COLLEGIS NOSTRIS malunt Hæreticos honorem dare quam Nobis Consentire, & dum unius Baptismi asseruatione baptizare venientes Nolunt sic aut Duo ipsi Baptismata faciunt, dum & apud Hæreticos baptismata esse dicunt; aut

certe quod est gravius, Hæreticorum fordidam & profanam Tinctionem, Vero & Unico & legitimo Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Baptismo præponere & præferre Contendunt. *Ibid.* — Nos non debemus Stuporem Hæreticis Patrociniis Nostri Consensus augere — *Ep.* 73. p. 199 — NOS (*Episcopi*) de Divino permisso rigamus Sitientem Dei populum; NOS Custodimus terminos vitalium fontium — cur ergo Prævaricatores veritatis, cur proditores Unitatis existimamur? *ibid.* p. 203. — Quid est igitur quam participem Hæreticis Blasphemantibus fieri, defendere velle & asserere quod remissam peccatorum accipere in Christi Nomine possit, aliquis in Hæresi, &c. *ibid.* p. 206. & p. 207. *It is* Execranda & Detestanda res — and alienis imo æternis peccatis Communicare — *Sexcenta talia facile fuisset Congessisse.*

(l) Vide infra, Chap. IX.

(m) Rescripti
F. C. ad literas
tuas (*super hac
Controversia de
Hæreticorum
Baptismo*)
quantum par-
va Nostri
Mediocritas
valuit — Ne-
mini præscri-
bentes quo-
minus statuatur
quod putat

Peace with any Bishop, upon the Account of their *Ratifying Heretical or Schismatical Baptisms.* (m) And the same he says concerning another Controversy likewise agitated in those days about Baptism, viz. about the *Integrity of Baptism* perform'd by *Sprinkling.* (n) They were the *Bishops*, I say, and the *Bishops alone*, whom he said he would not *break Peace* with, whom he would not *Excommunicate*, upon the Account of either of these Controversies: And now I can refer it to the Impartial and Judicious Reader, to determine if a clearer demonstration, of the *Bishops Sovereign Power* in *Baptism*, can be desired than this.

UNUSQUISQUE PRÆPOSITUS, actus sui rationem Domino redditurus, &c. *Ep.* 69. p. 188. ad Magnum.

Hæc tibi breviter — rescripsimus F. C. nemini Præscribentes aut Præjudicantes quo minus UNUSQUISQUE EPISCOPORUM quod putat faciat — Nos quantum in Nobis est, propter Hæreticos cum COLLEGIS & COEPISCOPIS NOSTRIS non Contendimus, cum quibus divinam Concordiam & Dominicam pacem tenemus — Servatur à Nobis patienter & firmiter caritas animi. COLLEGII honor, vinculum fidei & Concordia SACERDOTII. *Ad Jubaianum, Ep.* 73. p. 210.

Vide plura imprimis huc spectantia, in Prologo ad *Con. Carth.* Nobis hætenus sæpius repetita.

Hæc ad Conscientiam tuam (*sic Synodus quadam Africana Stephanum alloquitur, Ep. inter Cyprianicas, 72. p. 197, 198. quæ tota de Hæreticorum Baptismo est*) & pro honore Communi, &c. — Ceterum scimus quosdam quod semel imberint Nolle deponere, nec Propositum suum facile Mutare, sed Salvo inter COLLEGAS pacis & Concordiæ vinculo, &c. — Qua in re nec NOS vim cuiquam facimus aut legem domus, cum habeat in Ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ Liberum Arbitrium UNUSQUISQUE PRÆPOSITUS, &c.

(n) Vide *Ep.* 69. p. 185.

§ CXIV. THUS I have insisted somewhat largely on the Bishops *Sovereign Power of Baptism*, according to the *Principles* of *St. Cyprian* and his Contemporaries. I wish my Prosecution of this *Episcopal Prerogative*, may not seem tedious to the Reader; and that it may not, let me tell him, that besides that I am not to insist on it every day, and was resolved, once for

for all, to Assert it. Besides this, I say, let the Reader know that I have digested my thoughts as succinctly as I could: (perhaps another could have done it better, and more briefly) I have omitted many things that might have made for the purpose: I have an Adversary to deal with, who (whether through Ignorance or Obstinacy, I shall not presume to determine) is not to be convinced by hints; and my Country-men seem to need to be a little fully inform'd in such Matters. There is likewise this Advantage I proposed to my self in the full prosecution of this point, That, besides, that it is a Matter of great Consequence, and irrefragably defeats G. R's second main Subterfuge; by my Management of this *Prerogative*, the Judicious Reader may perceive how possible it might have been for me to have Discussed G. R's Book very fully and demonstratively, had I had a mind for it.

C H A P. VII.

G. R's *Second Main Subterfuge*, viz. *That a Bishop in St. Cyprian's Time had only more Dignity, but not more Power than Presbyters, finally overthrown by a brief Representation of the Bishops Sovereign Interest in some of the most weighty and eminent Acts of Government.*

ALL Acts of Government in the Church, as in other Political Bodies, may be competently, as they are commonly reduced to two Heads, *Legislation* and *Jurisdiction*; the Making of Laws, and the Execution of them, for the Good of the Society. If therefore it can be shewn, that by the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, the Bishop had a *Sovereign Interest* in both these, I cannot see what can be farther Requisite for giving the Final Overthrow to this *Subterfuge* of G. R's. Let us try it then, in both, and begin with the *Power of Legislation*. § I.

L A W S, *Canons, Constitutions, Statutes, Decrees, Rules, Forms*, (call them as you will) with regard to the Government of Churches, in the Cyprianic Age, were either of a more § II.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

more Confin'd and Restrict'd, or a more Extended and Diffus'd Obligation. Some reach'd only single *Diocesan* Churches: Others, *Provinces*: And a third sort there was which reach'd the whole *Church Catholick*: And without hesitation, I do affirm that, by the Principles of that Age, the Bishops *Interest* was *Sovereign* in *Making Laws* or *Canons* for the *Regulation* of his own *Diocese*: And, so far as can be Learn'd from the *Monuments* of those *Times*, it was something *more* than *Sovereign*, it was *Sole* in *Making Laws* or *Canons* for the *Regulation* of *Provincial Churches*, and the *Church Catholick*.

§ III.

I. I SAY, The Bishops *Interest*, by the Principles of that Age, was *Sovereign* in *Making Canons* for the *Regulation* of his own *Diocess*. I say *Sovereign*, I do not say *Sole*, because I am unwilling to have unnecessary Controversies with G. R. Tho' had I said [*Sole*] I might have had very Plausible Arguments (more Plausible, I dare confidently aver, than G. R. can have for most of those things he has so confidently affirmed in his Book) for saying so. For,

§ IV.

1. THERE are many very plain Assertions in the *Cyprianic Monuments*, which would seem so clearly to Import the Bishops *Absolute Power* of giving *Laws* to his own *Diocess*, as perhaps it may trouble G. R. or any of his Party, so lidly to avoid their Tendency that way. Such Assertions as these, That *every Bishop has Freedom to Determine Matters relating to his own Church*, (a) *by virtue of his own Absolute and Independent Power*. That *every Bishop*, so long as he maintains *Catholick Unity*, *may Order and Dispose the Affairs of his own Church*, as he thinks he can Answer to God. (b) That *every Bishop has a Portion of the Common Flock* (the *Catholick Church*) *Assign'd to him*, to be *Rul'd and Govern'd by him*, for which he is *Accountable to God only*. (c) That *every Bishop may [Statuere] make Statutes*, as he thinks fit, within his own District. (d) That *every Bishop has the Free determination of his own will in the Administration of his Church*. (e) That *every Bishop has so much the Free Power of his own Arbitriment*, that he may do in his own *Diocess* what seems good unto him. (f) These are very full Assertions of the *Episcopal Power*; so full, that I cannot think G. R. would ever have had the Courage to have Question'd the *Episcopal Sovereignty*, if he had had the good fortune to have considered them. I need not here transcribe *St. Cyprian's* own words, having

(a) T. I. p. 229.

(b) Ep. 55. p. 110.

(c) Ep. 59. p. 135.

(d) Ep. 69. p. 188.

(e) Ep. 72. p. 198.

(f) Ep. 73. p. 210.

done

done that more than once in this Book : All therefore I have farther to say, is, That G. R. may happen to find it no easy Work to make these Assertions handsomly *piece* in with his *Hypothesis*. One Limitation I shall readily admit of, because I am assured St. Cyprian himself would readily have admitted it : Namely, That every particular Bishop *had this Power only in Matters Undetermined by the Word of God ; or, by the Canons, or Radicated Customs of the Catholick Church ; or, by the Common Authority of the Province in which he had his Diocefs.* But this Limitation can be of no use to G. R. no Limitation can be useful to him, but such as might have tied up the Bishop from attempting to make any *Canon* without the *Concurrent Voices* of the *Major Part* of the *Presbytery* ; which Limitation, the aforesaid Assertions do not seem to me very inclinable to admit of. Especially, if,

2. WE consider what St. Cyprian's Practice was, while he was in his Retirement. Search all the Epistles written by him during that time, and you may find that sometimes he had a *Deacon*, sometimes a *Lector*, or an *Acolyth*, sometimes *no Clergy-man* at all with him ; but you shall never find *one Carthaginian Presbyter* named by him, or intimated to have been with him, all that while. On the contrary, as it is plain that their *Presence* in the *City* was the more *necessary* that he was *Absent*, so, you may find him fairly insinuating, and very frequently too, that he left them all behind in it, as those who might stay in it more securely and freer of all hazard than himself could have done : And you may find him frequently *wishing to be with them*, &c. which, I think, is Argument enough that they were not with him when he wrote so. (g) And yet, during that same time of his Retirement, you may find him *giving Laws* to his *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, sometimes in Matters of lesser Consequence, and sometimes of greater, *e. g.*

§ V.

(g) Et quoniam mihi interesse nunc non permittit Loci Conditio Peto vos (P.P.

& D.D.) pro fide & Religione vestra fungamini illic & vestris partibus & meis, ut nihil vel ad Disciplinam vel ad Diligentiam defit. Ep. 5. p. 10. Saluto vos optans cito ad vos venire ut desiderio tam meo quam vestro, & omnium fratrum Satisfiat. Oportet nos tamen paci Communi Consulere, & interdum, quamvis cum tadio animi Nostri, deesse vobis (Presbyteris & Diaconis) ne Prasentia Nostri invidiam & Violentiam Gentilium provocet. Ep. 7. p. 14.

Fretus ergo & dilectione & Religione vestra (P.P. & D.D.) quam satis novi his literis & Hortor & MANDO ut Vos quorum minime illic (Carthagini) invidiosa, & non adeo periculosa Prasentia est, vice mea fungamini, &c. Ep. 14. p. 31. His paria plurima facillime possent Colligi.

WHILE

§ VI.

(b) Ep. 5. p. 10.
Ep. 7. p. 14.
Ep. 12. p. 28.
Ep. 14. p. 31.
(i) Ep. 5. p. 11.
Ep. 12. p. 27.
Ep. 14. p. 32.
(k) Ep. 12. p. 27.
(l) Ep. 5. p. 10.
Ep. 14. p. 31.
(m) Ep. 11. p. 26.
Ep. 17. p. 40.
Ep. 20. p. 43.
Ep. 26. p. 51.

(o) Supra, Cap. V. § XX, &c.

(p) Interim
Temerarii &
Incauti & Tu-
midi quidam
inter vos
(Presbyteros)
qui Hominem
non Cogitent,
vel Deum ti-
meant SCI-

ENTES quoniam si ultra perseveraverint (si Lapsi Contra quam Mandavi, dederint) Utar ea admonitione qua me uti Dominus jubet, ut interim prohibeantur OFFERRE, &c. Ep. 16. p. 38.

(q) Interea si quis Immoderatus & Præceptis five de NOSTRIS PRESBYTERIS vel DIACONIS, five de Peregrinis, ausus fuerit ante Sententiam Nostram Communicare cum Lapsis, à Communicatione Nostra arceatur; apud Omnes Nos (Episcopos in Concilio Congregatos) causam dicturus Temeritatis suæ, quando in Unum, permittente Domino, Convenerimus. Ep. 34. p. 68.

WHILE thus in his Retirement, " He sends them particular *Orders* concerning the *Poor*, (b) *Visiting the Confessors in Prison*, (i) Recording particularly and accurately, the days on which any Martyrs or Confessors died in Prison, that afterwards due Regards might be paid to their Memories. (k) He constitutes them his *Vicars*, and commands them to do both his Work and their own. (l) He Orders them to communicate such and such of his Epistles to the People. (m) And of others of them, to give Copies to such Stranger Bishops, or Clergy-men, as at any time should happen to be in the City. (n) All these things he Enjoins Authoritatively, and in the Style of a Superiour, as is evident to any who reads the Epistles in which they are contained. But lest these should be deem'd Matters of lesser consequence, I add that even in Matters which were then Reputed (and deservedly) of very great Importance, he Exercised this his *Legislative Power*. I have already fully accounted how his *Presbyters* and *Deacons* wrote to him for a *Form* to be observed by them with Regard to the *Lapsers*, and told what *Form* he sent them, and how he himself called it a *Law* which he then gave them: (o) But this is not all, he likewise peremptorily forbid them to *Reconcile* any *Lapsers* otherwise than he had *Ordered* them to be *Reconciled*: And he not only condemned it as an unaccountable and unexampled presumption, if they should offer to *Reconcile* those *Lapsers* otherwise than he had *prescribed*, but he added a very severe *Sanction* to his *Law*: (And what is a *Law* but the *Will* of a *Lawgiver*, with a *Sanction* added to it?) He threatens them with a *Suspension* from the *Exercise* of their *Office*; (p) nay, even with *Excommunication* it self, (q) if they should transgress. G. R. when at leisure, may try how this Argument may be hindered from concluding, that by the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*, the *Bishop*, even by himself, might have given *Laws* to all his *Clergy*, *Presbyters* as well as others. I doubt, he shall not find it very Easy, especially if it be farther considered,

3. THAT this Power of giving Laws, by himself, to his Presbyters and Deacons, seems not only Naturally, but Necessarily to Result from divers of the Prerogatives accounted for in the preceding Chapter, *e.g.* What Master of a Ship is not Enabled, upon occasion, to give Orders to the Rest of the Mariners? How can One have the Ballance of Government in his Hand, without a Power to Restrain Subordinate Governors from Acting in some Cases, and to Oblige them to Act so and so in others? To what purpose is it to make one Chief Priest, and Subject all other Priests to him (nay, how can this be done?) without obliging the subjected Priests, in many Cases, to Obey his Authority? And, what can be for a Chief Pastor, who can give no Laws,* prescribe no Rules to Inferiour and Dependent Pastors? Or, for a Commander in Chief in an Army, who can on no Occasion, without the consent of the Major Part, in a Council of War, give Orders to Inferiour Officers? Or, for a Supreme Magistrate, that cannot, in any Case, by himself, give Laws to Inferiour Magistrates? Once more,

4. THE Bishops Power of giving Laws to his Presbyters and Deacons, is most evidently contain'd in that Famous Passage of our Martyr's, *Ep. 14.* The Matter in short is this: Four of his Presbyters had, by an Epistle, Represented to him, while in his Retirement, the eagerness of some Lapsers to be Reconciled to the Church; and had required his Determination, his Will and Pleasure in the Matter. This, for any thing we can learn, was the First Account he had got of the precipitancy of those Lapsers, and their Unreasonable and Unseasonable urgency to be Restored to the Peace of the Church. No wonder therefore if it surpriz'd him, and he had not digested his Thoughts so ripely about it, as afterwards he did, when he had got more Informations, and had more Time to consider it. Wherefore he Returns this Answer: *As to that which my Fellow-Presbyters Donatus and Fortunatus, Novatus and Gordius wrote to me, I can Return no Answer, seeing when I first entered on my Episcopal Office, I determined to do nothing by my self, without your Advice, and the Consent of my People.* (r) The Matter thus truly

§ VIII.

(r) Ad id vero quod Scripserunt mihi Compresbyteri Nostri, Donatus & Fortunatus, Novatus & Gordius, Solus rescribere nihil potui, quando à Primordio Episcopatus mei STATUERIM nihil sine Consilio Vestro (Presbyterorum & Diaconorum) & sine Consensu plebis, mea privatim sententia gerere. *Ep. 14. p. 33.*

Repre-

Represented, these Things are plain, 1. That those Four Presbyters supposed that, *as Bishop*, he had *Power* to have given a *Present Resolution* of the *Case* they *Proposed* to him: A present Order concerning the Reconciliation of the Lapsers. Had they not supposed this, their Epistle to him had been notorious *Banter*; and he had surely Resented it at another Rate than he did: For, in such an Afflicted and Mortifying State of the Church, when she was under such a violent Persecution as had made him retire from his Charge, what else had it been than a plain *Ridiculing* of him, to have requir'd him to give *Orders* about such a serious Concern, when he had *no Power* to give *Orders* about it? Nothing plainer therefore, than that they supposed he had *Power* to have given the *Orders* they required. Agreeably, 2. The Grain of his Answer keeps pace exactly with such a Supposition: He could not give the *Orders* they demanded; why, Because, when he entered to his Bishoprick, [STATUERAT] he had Resolved or Determined to do nothing without the aforesaid Advice and Consent: The very word he uses, (as I said in my former Book (s) so I say yet) manifestly implies that there was no more in it than his own *voluntary Condescension*: It was a thing he was not *Bound* to by any *Divine Prescript*, or any *Apostolical Tradition*, or any *Ecclesiastical Constitution*, viz. Thus to determine with himself to do nothing of Consequence without the *Advice* of his *Clergy*, and the *Consent* of his *People*. And whatever G. R. has been pleas'd to say against it, (t) I had good reason to put [STATUERIM] in Capital Letters, as *Emphatically* signifying that it was intirely the *Result* of his own *Free Choice* that he did so determine; and had he pleas'd he needed not have done it. And let me tell G. R. that his suggestion, viz. *That it is usual with good Men, when they enter on an Office, to Resolve to keep within the Bounds of their Power; to manage it Lawfully, as well as to cede in what is their Right,* (u) when applied to the Business in hand, in the Sense he means it, is next Neighbour to Ridiculous. For it is as if St. Cyprian, when some of his Presbyters wrote to him for a *Form*, should have answered, He could give them *no Form*, because it was not in the *Power* of a *Bishop* to give *Forms* to *Presbyters*. Now, besides that if St. Cyprian had meant so, it had been as Easy as it was Necessary for him, to have worded it other wise; besides that, the words he has actually used, cannot be strain'd

(s.) Princ.
Cyp. Age,
p. 39.

(t) Cyp. B.
Exam. § 41.
p. 57.

(u) Ibid.

strain'd by any violence to admit of G. R's Gloss : Besides these things, I say, we have a demonstration that he meant no *more*, nor no *other*, than his own *Voluntary Condescension*, viz. That afterwards, whilst still in his Retirement, he did actually, by himself, and without asking either the *Advice* of his *Clergy*, (nay, contrary to their Inclinations) or the *Consent* of his *People*, prescribe a *Form* to them, in this ^(v) *Supra*, same very *Case* of the *Lapsers*, as we have already seen. ^(v) § VI.

NEITHER can it be reasonably Objected, that in doing § IX.
so, he did not stand to his Resolution which he had made when he entered to his Bishoprick : For *Common Equity* will readily allow, that all such Resolutions are to be *favourably Construed*, and he who makes them is always *Master* of them. They are *Rules* which Governours may lay down to themselves, to be observ'd by them only *for the most part* ; not peremptorily and precisely in every *Case* ; not in *Cases* extraordinary, and which they could not possibly have foreseen, when they made such Resolutions. In short, no Man can reasonably say, that it is imprudently done of Governours to lay down to themselves *General Measures* to *Steer* by, in the *ordinary* Course of their Administration : And no Man can reasonably say, that *no Cases* can happen in which it may not only be *Prudent*, but *Necessary* for them to *Recede* from those *Measures* : And *Common Sense* will say, that *he*, who can *Recede* from *Measures* he had laid down to himself, (as we find *St. Cyprian* did) had it in his own *Power*, before he laid down such *Measures* to himself, to have laid them down or not. And so much concerning this passage at present ; we shall have another occasion, by and by, to consider what more G. R. has said about it.

FROM these Considerations, I have briefly Represented § X.
(and many more might have been added) it is manifest that a Bishop, in *St. Cyprian's* Time, could by himself, by his own *Singular Authority*, in many *Cases*, give Laws to all within his *Diocess*, *Presbyters* as well as others. We have most clearly seen, that *St. Cyprian* (one of the humblest and condescendingest of all the Primitive Bishops) actually did it ; and that in *doing* it, he *did* nothing amiss ; nothing contrary to the Current Principles of his Time ; nothing but what those Principles warranted ; nay, sometimes required him to *do* : So that there is no reason to think he was *Singular* in

it : There is rather reason to believe that it was *done* very *ordinarily* by every Bishop as he had occasion ; and yet I am very far from affirming that it was *always* so. I shall most willingly and readily Confess, that *for the most part*, Bishops made no *Canons*, gave no *Laws* to their *Diocesses*, without the *Advice* of their Clergy, especially their *Presbyters*. Their *Presbyters*, I say, did *ordinarily* sit with them, and were a *Senate* to them, as *St. Jerom* words it : And without the *Advice* of this *Senate*, they did not *ordinarily* proceed in either *Acts* of *Legislation* or *Jurisdiction*. So we read, *Ep. 49.* written by *Cornelius* to *St. Cyprian*, in which he tells him, that when divers, who had formerly sided with *Novatianus*, were earnest to be reconciled to the true Church, he *Convocated the Presbytery*, and ask'd their *Opinions*, that the Matter might be done with *Consent* of all. (w) And *Ep. 53.* Those Persons who were thus Reconciled to the Catholick Church, give an Account to *St. Cyprian*, that they had made their *Peace* with *Cornelius* their *Bishop*, and with *all the Clergy*. (x) And *St. Cyprian*, *Ep. 45.* makes mention of the *Presbyters* who *sate* with *Cornelius*. (y) And *Ep. 59.* of the *most flourishing Clergy* who *presided* with him ; or, as some Copies have it, *were present* with him. (z) And *Ep. 40.* when our Martyr, from the place of his Retirement, sends *Numidicus* to *Carthage*, to be one of the *Presbyters* of that Church, he tells the rest of his *Presbyters*, and his *Deacons*, and all the People, That *the special Hand of God was in it, who had preserved the said Numidicus, that he might joyn him* (says he) *to my Clergy, and might adorn the Desolation of my Presbytery with Glorious Priests*—and, we hope, from the *Divine Mercy*, many *Ornaments of this kind* ; and that he will make such *Meek and Humble Persons* to flourish in the

(w) Omni igitur Actu ad me perlato, placuit Contrahi PRESBYTERIUM. Adfuerunt etiam Episcopi quinq; qui & hodie praesentes fuerunt ut firmato Consilio quid Circa personam eorum Observari deberet, Consensu Omnium (si modo Omnium etiam ad Presbyteros extenden-

dum sit, & non ad Solos Episcopos Coarctandum) Statueretur : Et ut motum Omnium & Consilium Singulorum dignosceres, etiam Sententias Nostras placuit in Notitiâ vestri proferri, quas & Subjectas leges. His ita gestis, in PRESBYTERIUM venerunt Maximus Urbanus, Sidonius & Macarius, & pleriq; fratres qui ei (Novatiano) se adjunxerant, &c. *Ep. 49. p. 92, 93.*

(x) Nos habito Consilio—cum Episcopo Nostro Cornelio pariter & cum Universo CLERO pacem fecisse, cum gaudio etiam Universæ Ecclesiæ. *Ep. 53. p. 98.*

(y) Et ideo F. C. eum ad me talia de te & COMPRESBYTERIS tecum CONSIDENTIBUS scripta venissent, &c. *Ep. 45. p. 87.*

(z) Et quanquam Sciam, F. C. pro mutua dilectione quam debemus & exhibemus invicem Nobis, Florentissimo CLERO illic tecum PRÆSENTI (PRÆSENTI legunt quidam Codd

Honour

MSS.) & Sanctissimæ atq; amplissimæ plebi legere te semper literas Nostras. — Ep. 59. p. 139.

Honour of our CONSISTORY. (a) And again, he makes mention of the Assembly or Consistory of his Clergy, Ep. 59. (b) And Ep. 39. he tells his Presbyters and Deacons, and People, that tho' at that time he had made *Aurelius* and *Celerinus*, *Lectors* only, yet he design'd, that when they should be of Age, they should be promoted to the Honour of Presbyters, and should SIT with him. (c) And to the same purpose he writes concerning *Numidicus*, Ep. 40, viz. That his Will was that *Numidicus* should be Lifted in the Number of *Carthaginian Presbyters*, and SIT with him, (d) no doubt in the [Confessus] in the Consistory or Ecclesiastical Senate. So it was at Rome and Carthage; and so, doubtless, all the World over, particularly at *Alexandria*, where, as we are told by *Origen*, in an Epistle Recorded by *Eusebius*, (e) *Heracles* SAT in the Presbytery of the *Alexandrians*, that is, was a Presbyter, one of those who sate in the Ecclesiastical Senate, while *Demetrius* was Bishop.

(a) Sed (*Numidicus* inter vivos) remanendi — hæc causa ut cum CLERO NOSTRO Dominus adjungeret, & desolatam per lapsum quorundam PRESBYTERII NOSTRI Copiam gloriosis Sacerdotibus adornaret — Interim quod ostenditur, fiat; ut cum gratiarum actione fasci-

piamus hoc Dei Munus, sperantes de Misericordia Domini ejusmodi Ornamenta Complura ut redintegrato Ecclesiæ suæ robore, tam mites & humiles faciat in CONCESSUS NOSTRI honore florere. Ep. 40. p. 79.

(b) — Quid Superest quam ut Ecclesia Capitolio (vides etiam Carthagini fuisse Capitolium) cedat, & recedentibus Sacerdotibus, ac Domini Altare remonentibus, in CLERI NOSTRI SACRUM VENERANDUMQUE CONCESSUM Simulacra atq; idola cum aris suis transeant, &c. Ep. 59. p. 139. Ubi forte Confessus locum Significat in quo Clerus Considerare Solebat, sed res eodem redit.

(c) Ceterum Presbyterii honorem designasse nos illis (*Celerino nempe & Aurelio Lectoribus hætenus duntaxat factis*) jam SCIATIS ut & Sportulis iisdem cum Presbyteris Honorentur, & Divisiones Mensurnas æquatis quantitatis partiantur, SESSURI nobiscum proventus & Corroboratis annis suis. Ep. 39. p. 78.

(d) — *Numidicus* Presbyter adscribatur Presbyterorum Carthaginensium Numero, & nobiscum SEDEAT in Clero. Ep. 40. p. 78.

(e) — Καὶ ὁ τὸν ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ καθιζόμενον ἀλεξανδρίαν Ἡρακλῆν — Euseb. Ec. Hist. Lib. 6. Cap. 20.

THIS, as I have said; I shall readily grant, was the Ordinary and Stated Course of Government: It was not always, but on such and such Occasions, and in such and such Circumstances, that the Bishop interposed with his Absolute and Singular Authority: Ordinarily, and for the most part, he brought Matters to the Confessus, to the Presbytery, and did

§ XI.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

not proceed without the Advice of his Clergy, especially his Presbyters, who alone had the Honour to SIT with him: And, no doubt, Bishops, in this, did Act very prudently. No doubt, the Truth of such Aphorisms as these [*where no Counsel is, the People perish or fall, but in the Multitude of Counsellors is safety*] Prov. 11. 14. And [*without Counsel purposes are disappointed, but in the Multitude of Counsellors they are Established*] Cap. 15. 22. And [*every purpose is Established by Counsel*] Cap. 20. 18. is Indisputable: And the State of Affairs, and the Circumstances Bishops were then in, made it obviously prudent for them to do as few things as they could, without Common Consent. But then I do affirm that a Bishop, *e.g.* St. Cyprian, for all that, had a Sovereign Power, such a Power, as that All his Presbyters joyn'd together, all concurring in one Opinion, in one Resolution, in one Vote, could not make a Canon without him, and far less against him. This follows necessarily and unavoidably, from the preceding Considerations insisted on § IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX. And we have a most remarkable Instance of this his Sovereignty, and that even the Major part of his Presbyters could do nothing against him, clearly Recorded in his Epistles and other Monuments: This Instance, that the Major part of his Presbyters united their Resolutions, and joyn'd their Heads against him, and yet were Condemn'd all the World over, not only by the Bishops, but even by their Brethren Presbyters. The Matter, in short, is this: He was Bishop of Carthage, and when he wrote his 43d Epistle (the 40th according to Pamelius his Numbers) there were only Eight Presbyters belonging to the Church of Carthage: Of these Eight, Five, *viz.* Fortunatus, Jovinus, Maximus, Donatus and Gordius, united their Counsels against him: And Three only, Britius, Rogatianus and Numidicus, stood with him: Had he been no more than a Simple Moderator of the Presbytery, 'tis manifest he had been fairly and legally, and irreprehensibly out Voted, for he and his Three made in all but Four, and there were Five against them; and yet all the World judged the Five Guilty, guilty of Rebellion against him their Bishop, and Ratified and Confirmed his Sentence of Excommunication which he pronounced against them. Whoso is Curious to see this Episcopal Sovereignty more fully accounted for, and how his Presbyters could do nothing

nothing without him, and far less against him, let him turn to the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*, and read from Page 56. to Page 72. for what G. R. has said against what is there Discoursed, is so infinitely weak and impertinent, that I do not think it necessary to say one word in Vindication of it.

TO conclude this Branch of the Episcopal Sovereignty, his Legislative Power, the whole Account amounts to this: A Bishop in the *Cyprianic Age*, by the Received Principles of that Age, had such a Power as that, by himself, when he thought it Expedient, he could have given Laws to all his Clergy, Presbyters as well as others; and that he did it not always, was the Result of Prudence, not any Defect of Power. In a word, I cannot express it better than St. Jerom has done before me: When he did things in the ordinary current Course of Government, by the Advice of his Clergy, he followed the Example of Moses, who tho' he had it in his Power to be the Sole Governour of Israel, yet chused out Seventy to Assist him in Judging the People. (f) Only one Inference let me here make: It is that, if the Bishops of the *Cyprianic Age* had such an Absolute Power as I have accounted for, and if they, notwithstanding this their Absolute Power, did yet judge it Prudent, in most Cases, to Act by the Advice of their Respective Presbyteries, then it must needs follow that they did not judge themselves bound to act always Absolutely; but that it was very Lawful, as well as Prudential for them, to Restrict themselves in the Ordinary Administration of their Government, so far, as to Act with Counsel and Advice. From this it follows, That even the Bishops of the *Cyprianic Age* themselves being Judges, there is no Errour in our *Scottish* Constitution, whereby Bishops are Limited to Act with the Advice and Consent of their Presbyters in making Canons, and in performing Ordinations, and all weighty and momentous Acts of Jurisdiction. And certainly their Episcopal Sovereignty is Salved by their having a Negative over their Presbyters; by having such a Power, as that their Presbyters can do nothing without them, or in opposition to them. But if this be so, then it is very plain that G. R. made but a very weak and ineffectual Attack in the 5th page of his Book, when he pretended that I did not make my

§ XII.

(f) In Comment. in Epist. ad Titum.

Scottish

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

Scottish Bishops (as he calls them) *such Bishops as I had made those of the Cyprianic Age*; for now he may see I made our *Scottish Bishops* the same very thing that the *Bishops* of the *Cyprianic Age* made themselves in the *Ordinary Course* of their Government. Nay, he may farther see, that all the difference (if there was any considerable) between the *Cyprianic* and the *Scottish Bishops*, is so far from making for, that it most manifestly makes *against Scottish Presbyterians*, in that, so much as is of it, lies *here*, that the *Cyprianic Bishops*, tho' commonly they *Acted with Consent* of their *Presbyters*, yet were they *not bound up by Canons from Acting Absolutely*, when they saw occasion for it, whereas our *Scottish Bishops* are *limited*, by the very *Constitution*, to do nothing of Consequence by themselves; and by Consequence there is not *now* that hazard of *Arbitrary Government* in *Scotland*, as there was all the *World* over in the *Days of St. Cyprian*. And so I proceed to consider,

§ XIII.

II. THE *Interest* the *Bishops* of the *Cyprianic Age* had in *Provincial Councils*; and here, without scruple, I lay down this Position, That in *Provincial Councils*, whether in *making of Canons*, or *determining of Cases*, or *deciding of Controversies*, or *forming of Sentences*, or *inflicting of Censures*, &c. *Bishops alone* had *Definitive Voices*. This is obviously a Point of considerable Consequence, and if it can be made to appear to be true, G. R. I think, will have enough to do, if he shall undertake to defend his *Examination of the Cyprianic Bishop*. I shall therefore endeavour to prove it, and remove all the little *Objections* that may be rais'd against it. It might be proved,

§ XIV.

I. BY an Induction of all the *Canons*, &c. which, in those days, were made in *Provincial Councils*. Thus, for Example, The Canon mention'd by *St. Cyprian*, Ep. 1. *forbidding Clergy-men to be nominated Tutors or Curators to Minors*, was made by *Bishops met in Council*. (g) And the

(g) — Cum
jampridem in

Concilio EPISCOPORUM Statutum sit ne quis de Clericis & Dei Ministris Tutorem vel Curatorem Testamento suo Constituat. Ep. 1. p. 1. & rursus, p. 2. — Quod EPISCOPI Antecessores Nostri religiose Considerantes & Salubriter Providentes Censuerunt ne quis Frater excedens ad Tutelam vel Curam Clericum Nominaret.

Canon

Canon allowing *Adulterers to do Penance and to be Reconciled*, mentioned *Ep. 55.* was clearly Enacted by the Episcopal Authority. (b) So was the Canon (shall I call it, or *Resolve*) mentioned by our Martyr, *Ep. 48.* about not writing to *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, till they should more fully understand the State of the Controversy between him and *Novatianus*. (i) And what greater Evidence can we have for any thing than we have for the Bishops *Sole Power of Defining* in *Provincial Councils*, in those *Synodical Epistles* which are Extant among *St. Cyprians*? e.g. The 57th is written to *Cornelius* by *XLI Bishops* Congregated in Council, which Bishops, all over the Epistle, do still suppose that they had the Government of their respective Churches in their own hands; and therefore, tho' in a former Council they had made a Canon, obliging all *Lapsed* to compleat their *Satisfactions* before their *Reconciliation*, yet now, that a fresh *Persecution* was so apparently imminent, they had judged it reasonable to mitigate the *Severity* of that preceding Canon, and Restore the *Penitents* to the *Communion* of the Church, before the *Persecution* should turn violent; that Receiving the Sacrament of our Lords Body and Blood, they might be *Arm'd and Fortify'd* against the *Fury* of it. (k) And *Ep. 64.* *LXVI Bishops* met in Council, give their Resolution of two Cases proposed to them by one *Fidus*; one concerning their *COLLEAGUE Therapius*, the other concerning the *Time of giving Baptism to Infants*. *Fidus* had told them that *Therapius*, Bishop of *Bulla*, had precipitantly, unseasonably, and contrary to the Canons, Absolved one *Victor* a *Presbyter* who had Lapsed; and their Resolution is, that their *COLLEAGUE Therapius* be *Rebuk'd* for such precipitancy, and told to do no more so, but the Sentence of Absolution once pronounced by him, must not be *Revok'd*. (l) *Fidus* had likewise craved

(b) — Nam & Machis à NOBIS pœnitentia tempus Conceditur & pax datur. *Ep. 55. p. 109.* A nobis inquit nempe Episcopis ut patet. *Ibid. p. 110. ubi sic,* Et quidem apud Antecessores Nostros quidam de EPISCOPIS istic in Provincia Nostra dandam Pacem Machis non putarunt, & in totum Pœnitentiæ locum contra adulteria clausurunt. *Ep. 55. p. 110.* (i) Sed cum Statuissimus COLLEGÆ Complares qui in Unum Conveneramus ut legatis ad vos COEPISCOPIS NOSTRIS Caldonio &

Fortunato Missis, omnia interim integra Suspenderentur, donec ad Nos iidem COLLEGÆ Nostri rebus illic aut ad pacem redactis, aut pro veritate Compertis redirent. Presbyteri & Diaconi in Adrametina Consistentes, Polycarpo Coepiscopo Nostro absente ignorabant quid Nobis in Commune placuisset, &c. Ep. 48. p. 90, 91. Vide infra.

(k) Vide *Ep. 57. tot. Pamelio. 54.*

(l) Legimus Literas tuas, F. C. quibus Significasti de Victore quondam Presbytero, quod ei antequam Pœnitentiam plenam egisset—temere Therapius COLLEGA noster (omnes ergo illi *LXVI. quorum Nomine scripta Epistola, Therapii Collegæ, i. e. Episcopi*) immaturo tempore & prapropere festinatione pacem dederit. Quæ res Nos satis movit, secessum esse à Decreti Nostri auctoritate—Sed librato apud Nos diu Consilio, satis fuit Objurgare Therapium

their

COLLEGAM NOSTRUM quod temere hoc fecerit, & instruxisse ne quid tale de Cetero faciat : Pacem tamen quomodocumq; à SACERDOTE DEI (*i. e. Episcopo*) semel datam, non putavimus auferendam, ac per hoc Victori Communicationem sibi Concessam usurpare Concessimus. Ep. 64. p. 158.

(m) Quantum vero ad Causam infantium pertinet—longe aliud in Concilio Nostro Omnibus visum est. In hoc enim quod tu putas esse faciendum (*in Octavum usq; nempe diem differendum esse Baptismum*)

nemo Consentit, p. 158. *fin.* 160. *init.* & rursus 161. Iccirco F. C. hæc fuit in Concilio Nostri (*nempe LXVI. Episcoporum*) Sententia, à Baptismo atq; à Gratia Dei—Neminem per Nos debere prohiberi.

(n) *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 5. Cap. 23, 24.*

their Resolution of this Case, whether Infants might be Baptized the second or third day after they were born, or whether their Baptism should be delayed till the Eighth day, according to the Ancient Law concerning Circumcision? And they are peremptory, that that Old Law is not in force, Infants may be Baptized any day after their Nativity. (m) And Ep. 67, 70, and 72. do most brightly contain that Bishops were the *only Definers* in Synods. In short, in all these Five Synodical Epistles I have Named, Bishops are not only the *SOLE Subscribers*, but they still talk of themselves as those who had it in their Power to Order such Matters as are Treated of in those Epistles. Indeed, nothing clearer than this *Episcopal Prerogative* of the *Definitive Voice* in Provincial Councils, from the Constitution of such Councils which met before St. Cyprian was a Bishop, for Determining the famous Controversy about *Easter*, as we learn from *Eusebius*. (n)

§ XV.

IT had been Easy to have adduced some other Instances, but for brevity I shall only insist on two more, such two as are indeed as good as two hundred, when they are thoroughly considered. The one concerning those who had *Lapsed* under the violence of the *Decian* Persecution : The other, concerning the *Validity* of *Heretical* and *Schismatical Baptisms*. Who so shall seriously digest and ponder what may be found in the *Cyprianic* Monuments relating to these two Matters, shall be forced to acknowledge (as far as plain Evidence can force him) that Bishops were the *only Definers* in the Synods Convocated to *Define* in them. I begin with the *Case* of the *Lapsed*.

The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, &c.

353
§ XVI.

THE Decian Persecution, by its mighty violence, prevail'd with vast Numbers of Christians to Renounce the Faith, and Sacrifice to the Heathen Deities. Such were called *Lapsers*. So soon as the Heat of the Persecution abated, these *Lapsers* trusting to their Numbers, and, particularly at *Carthage*, Encouraged by some of the Clergy, who retain'd old Grudges against St. Cyprian's Promotion to the Bishoprick, turn'd out of Measure urgent to be Restored to the Communion of the Church, before they had compleated the Satisfaction prescribed by the Ancient Canons and Customs of the Church. Hereupon, St. Cyprian being Bishop, was press'd, or rather almost oppress'd with Addresses, Letters, Sollicitations, Intercessions, Threatnings, all sorts of Arguments, from Martyrs, from Confessors, from the *Lapsers* themselves, from his Clergy, from all Hands, to grant Indulgences ; that is, to Dispense with the Canons, and Absolve the *Lapsers* sooner than was allowed by the Common Course of his Discipline. To all which Onsets, he returns for Answer this for Substance : That it was not Reasonable that He, by himself, in such a Case, should give Indulgences, or alter the Common Course of Discipline. The Persecution had had fatal Success in many other Churches besides his of *Carthage* : It was therefore a Matter of Common Concern, and in all Reason determinable by Common Consent, and Common Authority. Let the Church once have Peace ; Let it be Safe for Bishops to meet in Synods, and adjust Matters, interchange Sentiments, and Communicate Counsels, consider Circumstances, and agree on One Common Method, in a Case in which the Common Interest of Churches was so palpably Concerned. This, I say, is the Substance of his Answer, to all the Applications were made to him : And that which I take notice of in it, is, That such a Case cannot be determined but by *Synods* or *Councils*, or *Convocations* of *Bishops*. Of Bishops, I say, as being the only Persons who had Power and Authority to Determine in such a Case ; to Define in such an Exigence.

A a a

T H E R E .

(o) Audiant
quæſo pati-
enter Con-
ſilium ve-
ſtrum ex-
pectent re-
greſſionem
Noſtram
ut cum
—venerimus
Convocati
CO-EPIS-
COPI plu-
res, ſecun-
dum Domi-
ni discipli-
nam & Con-
feſſorum
præſentiam,
beatorum
Martyrum
litteras exa-
minare poſ-
ſimus. Ep.
17. p. 40.

(p) Supra,
Cap. V. § XX, &c.

(q) Ceteri qui nullo libello à Martyribus accepto invidiam faciunt, quia non paucorum nec Eccleſiæ unius aut unius Provinciæ ſed totius orbis hæc cauſa eſt expectent de Domini protectione Eccleſiæ ipſius pacem publicam. Hoc enim & verecundiæ & Disciplinæ & Vitæ ipſi om-
nium Noſtrum Convenit ut PRÆPOSITI cum Clero convenientes, præſente etiam Stantium plebe—diſponere omnia Conſilii Communis Religione poſſi-
mus. Ep. 19. p. 41.

(r) Legi autem & Univerſorum Confeſſorum litteras quas voluerunt per Me COLLEGIS omnibus innotefcere—Quæ res cum OMNIUM NOSTRUM Conſilium & Sententiam expectet, præjudicare Ego & Solus mihi rem Commu-
nem vindicare non audeo. Ep. 26. p. 51.

(s) De ceteris vero quæ agenda erunt, ſicut & COLLEGIS meis plurimis

byters

T H E R E are few things for which Testimonies can be more plentifully adduced from his Epistles than for this. Take the following Specimen. In his 17th Epistle, He most heartily beſeeches his People to be at pains with the Lapsers, to perſwade them to forbear to preſs their Reconciliation any farther, till ſuch time as BISHOPS may ſafely meet in Council, and Determine in an Affair ſo momentous. (o) And Epistle 19. (having given a Form to his Presbyters and Deacons concerning ſuch Lapsers as were in danger of Death, of which Form we have already (p) had enough) he tells them, that as for other Lapsers, they muſt wait till Bishops may meet in Council and Determine about them. (q) And Epistle 26. Having told his PP. and DD. that he had received a very threaten-
ing Addreſs (to be ſeen in Ep. 23.) from the Confeſſors, He gives them to underſtand, that to grant ſuch Diſpenſations as the Addreſs required, was a Matter which called for the Opinions and Judgments of all Bishops, and therefore he durſt not by himſelf Determine any thing about it. Of all Bishops, I ſay, for that the [Omnium Noſtrum] refers to his COL-
LE G U E S mentioned before, is clear as light to any that conſiders the Paſſage. (r) And Epistle 32. He again tells his Clergy, that ſuch and ſuch things Relating to the Lapsers, muſt be delayed till Bishops may have God's Allowance to Meet and Treat of them in Council. (s) And Epistle 34. He requires his Pres-

scripsi, plenius Consilio communi tractabimus, quando convenire in unum permittente domino Caperimus. Ep. 32. p. 65.

byters and Deacons to Communicate that Epistle to his COLLEGUES, that *One Course may be kept, and they may be in the greater readiness to treat more fully of all things, when they shall meet together.*

(i) And Epistle 41. *We shall Cognosce of all these things, (says he) when, God permitting, we shall meet with many of our COLLEGUES.* (u) And Ep. 43. He makes it an Aggravation of the Guilt of *Felicissimus* and his Party, that they had dared to Recon- cile the Lapsers, after that not only *He*, but the *Roman Confessors* and *Clergy*, and all *Bishops* on both side of the Sea, had Resolved that *no such thing should be done, till Bishops might meet in Council, and Agree on such a Course as might answer both Ends, of Discipline and of Mercy: And this Presumption of that Party he calls Rebellion, and a Subverting of the Foundations of the Authority and Power Episcopal.* (v) And Ep. 20. He tells the *Roman Clergy*, that his Answer to those of his own Presbyters and Deacons, &c. who had so earnestly pressed him for a Relaxation of the Severity of Discipline, was, That *that Matter concerning the Lapsers must be delayed till God should send Peace, and many Bishops might meet together.*

(w) And Ep. 55. He repeats the same Account to *Antonianus*. (x) And agreeably,

(i) Legite vero has easdem literas & COLLEGIS meis si qui aut praesentes fuerint, aut Supervenerint, ut Unanimes & Concordes ad fovenda & sananda Lapsorum vulnere confilium salubre teneamus, tractaturi plenissime de omnibus cum convenire---Caperimus. Ep.

34. p. 68.

(i) Quæ omnia tunc cognoscemus quando in unum cum COLLEGIS pluribus permittente Deo Convenerimus. Ep. 41. p. 80.

(v) Cum semel placuerit tam Nobis quam Confessoribus & Clericis Urbicis, item Universis EPISCOPIS vel in Nostra Provincia vel transmare Constitutis, ut nihil innovetur circa Lapsorum Causam nisi Omnes in unum Convenerimus, & collatis Consiliis cum Disciplina pariter & Misericordia temperatam Sententiam fixerimus contra hoc Consilium Nostrum REBELLETUR & omnis SACERDOTALIS AUCTORITAS & POTESTAS factiosis conspirationibus destruat. Ep. 43. p. 82, 83.

(w) Plane Ceterorum Causas quamvis libello à Martyribus accepto differri Mandavi, & in Nostram praesentiam reservari, ut cum pace à Domino Nobis data plures PRÆPOSITI convenire in unum Caperimus, communicato etiam vobiscum consilio disponere singula & reformare possimus. Ep. 20. p. 43, 44.

W H E N.

(x) De eo tamen quod Statuendum esset circa Lapforum causam, distuli, ut cum quies---data esset & EPISCOPIS in unum convenire indulgentia divina permetteret, tunc communicato & librato de omnium collatione consilio STATUEREMUS quid fieri oporteret. *Ep. 55. p. 102.*

§ XVIII. WHEN it pleased God to Rebuke the Persecution, and Restore Peace to the Church, the *African* Bishops met. in the *Council* so often referred to: The *Bishops*, I say, as *only* having the *Power* of *Defining*, are *only* mention'd by St. *Cyprian* as the Persons who met, as we may observe in the Account he gives of that Council to *Antonianus*. So soon as the *Persecution* Calmed, (says he) and we could safely meet, a *Copious Number* of *US BISHOPS*, whom Our Faith, and the Divine Protection, had Preserved from Lapsing, did Meet, as before had been intended, and having seriously considered the *Scriptures*, we Decreed, &c.—and least the *Number* of *BISHOPS* in *Africa* might have been *Reckoned* insufficient for Determining in so weighty a Case, we wrote to our *COLLEAGUE* *Cornelius* at *Rome*, who, with very many *BISHOPS* joyn'd with him in Council, did with equal *Seriousness* and *Moderation*, agree with us in the same Determination. (y) Thus we have a fair Account of the Bishops, their being the *only* *Definers* in their *Provincial Councils*, in the Case of the *Lapsers*.

(y) Secundum quod tamen antea fuerat desti-

natum, persecutione sopita, cum data esset facultas in Unum Conveniendi, Copiosus EPISCOPORUM Numerus quos integros & incolumes fides sua & Domini tutela protexit, in Unum Convenimus; & Scripturis diu ex Utraq; parte prolatis, temperamentum salubri Moderatione libravimus, ut nec in totum spes Communicationis & Pacis Lapsis denegaretur---nec tamen rursus Censura Evangelica solveretur---Ac si minus sufficiens EPISCOPORUM in Africa Numerus videbatur, etiam Romam super hac re scripsimus ad Cornelium COLLEGAM nostrum, qui & ipse cum plurimis COEPISCOPIS habito consilio, in eandem nobiscum sententiam pari gravitate & salubri Moderatione consensit. *Ep. 55. p. 102, 103.*

THE matter is every whit as plain, or rather plainer, concerning the Synods which defin'd in the Case of *Heretical* and *Schismatical Baptisms*. We have accounts of no fewer than Six of them, all consisting of *Bishops*. There was *One* before *St Cyprian's* time, when *Agrippinus* was Bishop of *Carthage*, which determin'd in this Matter; and *St. Cyprian* expressly tells us, that *Agrippinus* of famous Memory, with the rest of his *FELLOW BISHOPS*, who, at that time govern'd the Church of our Lord in *Africa* and *Numidia*, declared all Baptisms performed by *Hereticks*, to be invalid. (z) This is in his 71st Epistle to *Quintus*, and he has the same over again, in his 73^d. to *Subianus*. a) And *Novatus* a *Thamugade*, one of the Bishops which voted in the venerable Council of *Carthage*, Anno 256, plainly refers to the decision of that Council, holden by *Agrippinus*, as consisting intirely of *Bishops*. (b) Another Council which determined in this matter, was holden at *Iconium*, in which *Firmilian* was present: And another at *Synnada*: And both consisted of *Bishops*, as we learn from *Dionysius* the great Bishop of *Alexandria*, one of *Cyprian's* Contemporaries (c); not one word of Presbyters

§ XIX.

(z) Quod quidem & Agrippinus bonæ memoriæ vir, cum cæteris CO-EPISCOPIS suis qui illo tempore in provincia Africa & Numidia Ecclesiâ Domini GUBERNABANT,

statuit & librato consilii communis examine firmavit. Quorum Sententiam & Religiosam & Legitimam & Salutarem, fidei & Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Congruentem nos etiam secuti sumus. Ep. 71. pag. 196.

(a) Apud nos autem non nova aut repentina, res est ut Baptizandos Censeamus eos qui ab Hæreticis ad Ecclesiam veniunt; quando multi jam Anni sunt & Longa ætas ex quo sub Agrippino bonæ memoriæ viro convenientes in unum EPISCOPI plurimi hoc STATUERUNT: Hæreticos nempe ad Ecclesiam redeuntes esse Baptizandos, Ep. 73. p. 199.

(b) Et adeo secundum Testimonium Scripturarum & Secundum Decretum COLLEGARUM nostrorum Sanctissimæ Memorix Virorum, omnes Schismaticos & Hæreticos qui ad Ecclesiam Conversi sunt Baptizari; &c. Con. Carth. Suff. 4.

(c) Μεμνημένα ἔστι τῶν, ἐπὶ μὲν αὐτῶν ἐν Ἀρείῳ μόνον τῶ το παριστάμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ πολλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸν πᾶν ἐπὶ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥΣ ἐν ταῖς πολυάνθρωποις ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις, καὶ ταῖς Συνόδοις ὅτι ἀδελφῶν ἐν Ἰκονίῳ καὶ Συνάδοις καὶ παρὰ πολλοῖς τῶν ἐδούλων, &c. Euseb. H. E. L. 7. C. 7. De hac Synodo Iconiensi, vide etiam Firmiliani Epistolam, inter Cyprianicas Septuagesimam quintam, p. 221. ubi hæc legere est. Quod totum (viz. penes Hæreticos nullum esse Baptismum) Nos jam pridem in Iconio qui Phrygiæ locus est, collecti in unum, convenientibus ex Galatia & Cilicia & cæteris proximis regionibus, confirmavimus tenendum contra Hæreticos, &c. & rursus p. 226. Plurimi simul convenientes in Iconio diligentissimè tractavimus & confirmavimus repudiandum esse omne omnino Baptisma quod sit extra Ecclesiam constitutum. Nunquid omnes ex Galatia & Cilicia & cæteris proximis regionibus Presbyteri tunc temporis in Iconio convenerunt? At pauci forte à cæteris Delegati convenire potuerunt, Canones compingere, lites dirimere, Controversias finire, &c. Hocine pro more illius seculi? procul omni dubio nullas nisi Episcoporum Synodos novit Firmilianus, agnovit illud seculum. Sed de his aliàs plura.

in either of them, which in reason, can import no less than that, however they were present, yet they had no *Definitive voices*. In two Years time or thereabout, when *Stephen* made the Controversie pretty warm, we find Three *African Councils*, and in them, *Bishops alone* giving their *Decisions*. We have a *Synodical Epistle* of One of them. It is the 70th. in Number among *St. Cyprian's*. XXXII *Bishops* were present, and in their *Epistle* they speak of themselves, as the *Sole Definers*.

(d) Cum si- (d) A Second we have an account of *Ep 73* in which were
mul in Conci- present LXXI *Bishops*, who likewise were the *only Persons*,
lio effemus, who had *Definitive Voices*. (c)
Legimus lite-
ras vestras. L. 70. p. 189.

(e) Et quoniam super hac re quid sentiremus, literis nostris expressimus ut Compendium facerem, exemplum earundem literarum tibi misi quod in concilio cum plures ad essemus Decrevimus (*Hec de prima XXXII Episcoporum Synodo intelligenda: De Secunda, que sequuntur*) Et nunc quoque cum in unum convenissemus, tam provinciae Africae quam Numidiae E P I S C O P I Numero LXXI, hoc idem denuo Sententia Nostra firmavimus. *Ep. 73. p. 198.*

§ XX.

BUT the last of these Three *African Councils* which were holden in *St. Cyprian's* time, for determining the Question concerning Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, is, of all, the most considerable to our present purpose: It is that Council which consisted of LXXXVII *Bishops*: That Council whose Records are still extant among *St. Cyprian's Works*: That Council, the Suffrages whereof *St. Austin* examines in his Books about Baptism against the *Donatists*. This is that venerable Council convoked Anno 256. whereof *St. Cyprian* was *Preses*: 'Twas to the Suffrages of this Council I did so frequently refer in the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*, especially, p. 19. 20. And here, by the way, let me take notice of a learned Resentment *G. R.* has of my referring so frequently to it. *Though we have an account of Seven several Councils of Carthage* (says he) *in the ancient Records, yet this Author always citeth Concil. Carthag. without any Discrimination: If he miscite places, how shall this Error be discovered? for I think few will be at the pains to read over all the Acts of those Councils,*

(f) Cyp. B.
Exam.

§. 27. p. 34. 35.

for every one of his Citations (f). Was it possible that *G. R.* could be so inadvertent, as not to consider that our Controversie was about the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*, and by Consequence only determinable by the Monuments of that Age; at least, not by the Monuments of Posterious Ages?

And

And have we the Monuments or the Records of *Seven Carthaginian* Councils holden in *St. Cyprian's* time or before it? But as I said, this only by the way. To proceed, this is the Council, the Suffrages whereof I insisted so much on in the preceeding Chapter (g), while I was asserting the (g) § LXVII. Bishops *Soveraign Interest* in *Baptism*. And it was to this place that I did there (h) refer the Reader for Satisfaction, LXVIII. that I had reason to make such use of the Suffrages of it, as LXIX. I had done: And concerning the full force of a Demonstration which I there left unfinished (i). And now I come to perform my promise, as well as to clear the point presently in hand; or if you will, to perform the *One* by clearing the (i) § LXX. *Other*: And all may be very briefly done. For

It is not more evident that the Sun shines at Mid-day, than § XXI. it is in the Records of this venerable Council, that *Bishops* alone had *Definitive Voices* in it. For tho' many Presbyters were present, yet they were all *Bishops*, not *One* of them *simple Presbyters*, whose *Definitive Suffrages* are recorded. This alone might be enough: For how is it imaginable, that the *Definitive Suffrages* of *Presbyters* would not have been recorded as well as *Those* of *Bishops*, if they had had an *Equal Power* of giving them? But this is not all. For 2. *St. Cyprian*, *Præses* of the Council, in his admirable Discourse at the opening up of it, most plainly and emphatically excludes all who were not *Bishops*, from having *Decisive Voices*: All, I say, *Presbyters* as well as *Deacons*, and the *Plebs*, the *Laity*, which was also present. For 'tis only to his COLLEAGUES, to the *Bishops*, he directs his Discourse; and he directs it to them as being the *only Persons* who could *Decide*, *Define*, or *Determine* in the matter laid before them. The Discourse is so remarkable that perhaps it may not be amiss to translate it entirely and transcribe it. It runs thus, or to this purpose. *Many Bishops from the Provincial Africa, Numidia and Mauritania, having met together in Carthage, on the First of September; many Presbyters and Deacons being with them; a great number of the Laity being also present; the Epistle of Jubaianus (concerning the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismaticks) to Cyprian being read; and Cyprian's Return to him being likewise read, and also his Rejoinder: Cyprian (the Præses of the Council) said, you have heard, right well beloved COLLEAGUES, what Jubaianus our FELLOW BISHOP hath*

written to me, requiring my Sentiment concerning the unlawful and profane Baptism of Hereticks: You have heard the Return I gave him, containing that which more than once we have determined; Namely, that it is necessary that such Hereticks as come to the Church, should be baptized and sanctified with the Baptism of the Church. And you have heard what, according to his sincere and Religious Devotion he hath written again; and how he hath not only Consented but thankfully Confessed himself to have been instructed. It remains now that each of us declare our Opinion, judging no Man, refusing our Communion to no Man, tho' he shall think differently from us. For none of us Constitutes himself BISHOP of BISHOPS; or, by a tyrannical Terror, forces his COLLEAGUES into a necessity of Compliance; seeing every BISHOP, by virtue of his absolute Liberty and Power, has his own free Judgement; and can no more be Judged by another, than he himself can Judge another: But we do all expect the Judgement of our Lord Jesus Christ, who only and solely has Power to promote us in the Government of his Church, and to Judge of our Administration. This I say is the purport of the Discourse. I shall not pretend to be an exact Translator (tho' I am confident I have done neither Violence nor any other kind of Injustice to it) let therefore the stress lie on the original Words, as you have them faithfully transcribed in the Margent (k).

(k) Cum in unum Cartha-

gini convenissent Ka'end. Septembris EPISCOP I plurimi ex provincia Africa, Numidia & Mauritania, cum Presbyteris & Diaconibus, præsentæ etiam plebis maxima parte, & lectæ essent Literæ Jubaiani ad Cyprianum factæ, item Cypriani ad Jubaianum rescriptæ, de Hereticis Baptizandis, quidque post modum Cypriano Jubaianus idem rescripserit; Cyprianus dixit: Audistis, COLLEGÆ dilectissimi, quid mihi Jubaianus COEPISCOPUS NOSTER scripserit, consulens Mediocritatem Nostram de illicito & profano Hereticorum Baptismo; & quid Ego ei rescripserim; censens scilicet quod semel atque iterum & sæpe censuimus, Hereticos ad Ecclesiam venientes Ecclesiæ Baptismo baptizari & sanctificari oportere. Item lectæ sunt vobis & aliæ Jubaiani literæ, quibus pro sua Sincera & Religiosa devotione ad Epistolam nostram rescribens, non tantum consensit, sed etiam instructum se esse gratias egit. Superest ut de hac re singuli quid sentiamus proferamus; Neminem judicantes, aut à jure Communione aliquem si diversum senserit, amoventes. Neque enim quisquam Nostrum EPISCOPUM se EPISCOPORUM constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi Necessitatem COLLEGAS suos adigit; quando habeat omnis EPISCOPUS pro licentia Libertatis & Potestatis suæ, Arbitrium proprium; tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare: Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus & solus habet Potestatem & præponendi nos in Ecclesiæ suæ GUBERNATIONE, & de ACTU nostro judicandi. Tom. I. p. 229. 230.

IF G. R. shall not be convinc'd that Bishops alone in St. § XXII. Cyprian's time had Power to define in Provincial Councils, and that Presbyters as well as Deacons, nay, the Laity, were excluded from having the Privilege of Definitive Voices in such Councils; if the bright Evidences for these things contain'd in this Discourse, I say, shall not for ever close G. R.'s Mouth in this matter, I think it is but lost Labour to be at any further pains to convince him. And yet I have more to say. For 3. I have to back what I have said, no fewer than half a score of the Suffrages registred in the Records of the Council. Particularly, Novatus a Thamugade most evidently insinuates, that all the Definers were Bishops, when he says, *That he is for having all Hereticks baptiz'd, according to the Testimony of the Scriptures and the Decree of our COLLEAGUES* (says he) of most holy Memory (l): that is Agrippinus and those Bishops who with him had, long ago, determin'd the Case of Heretical Baptisms. Seeing Cyprian's Epistle to Jubaianus, and to Stephanus have been read in this great Convocation of most holy PRIESTS (m) that is, Bishops, says Crescens à Cirta. Our Lord (says Fortunatus à Thucabori) gave the power of Baptizing to Bishops &c. (n) and therefore He as a Bishop votes for Baptizing Hereticks. We assist the Church in which we preside, i. e. in which we are Bishops, says Januarius à Vico Casaris (o) All Men acknowledge &c. most holy FELLOW PRIESTS that humane presumption is not of equal force with the adorable Majesty of Our Lord Jesus Christ &c. (p) He calls those to whom he directs his Discourse, i. e. those who had power to Define, Fellow Priests, [CON SACERDOTES] A Compellation never bestowed in the Dialect of those times, by any Bishop, on any but Bishops. It is Felix ab Urbina, some of our COLLEAGUES (says Geminus à Furnis) may prefer Hereticks to themselves, but not to us (q), who I pray were his COLLEAGUES, and by consequence, whom did he mean by [US] but Bishops? Pudentianus à Cuiculi tells the venerable Assembly, that the Reason why he so long delayed to give his opinion, was, that he might first hear the Judgment of others, because he himself had been but lately made a BISHOP (r). You your selves know (says Victor ab Octavo)

(l) Secundum Testimonium Scripturarum & Secundum decretum COLLEGARUM NOSTRORUM. &c. Suff. 4.

(m) In tanto coetu Sanctissimorum SACERDOTUM &c. Suff. 8.

(n) Vide supra Cap. vi. § LXI. (o) Nos Ecclesiae assistimus in qua PRÆSIDEMUS &c. Suff. 23.

(p) Nemini dubium est Sanctissimi CON-SACERDOTES non in tantum posse humanam presumptionem. Suff. 26.

(q) Quidam de COLLEGIS Hæreticos præponere sibi possunt. &c. Suff. 59.

(r) Novitas EPISCOPATUS MEI effecit ut sustinerem quid majores judicarent. Suff. 71.

that

- that I am not long since made a Bishop, and therefore I watched to hear the opinion of those who had been Bishops before me (s). We have more than once already had occasion to consider the Suffrage of Confessor *Clarus à Muscula*, in which he manifestly makes Bishops the Successors of the Apostles, and thereby endowed with the Sovereign Power of Baptism; and by Consequence, only capable of Defining in a Controversie about Baptism (t). And *Natalis ab Dea*, for himself, and in name of *Pompeius Sabratenfis*, and *Dioga Leptimagnensis*, (who had given a Commission to declare their Judgments, because they could not be present) tells the Assembly, that both the Two from whom he had Commission, and himself, were of the same Judgment with their COLLEAGUES, i. e. the Bishops, who, before, had given their Definitive Sentences (u). And then St. *Cyprian* as Moderator of the Assembly, concludes all, with telling, that his Epistle to *Jubaianus* THEIR COLLEAGUE did most fully express his Sentiment (v).
- Leptimagnensis* qui mihi mandaverunt, corpore quidem absentes, spiritu præsentes, censemus quod & COLLEGE nostris: Suff. 83, 84, 85.
- (v) Meam Sententiam plenissime exprimit Epistola quæ ad *Jubaianum* COLLEGAM NOSTRUM (omnium qui præsentes sumus & Suffragia prompsimus Episcoporum) Scripta est. Suff. 87.

§ XXIII.

LIGHT itself is not clearer than it is from what I have said, (when all laid together,) that they were Bishops, and none but Bishops who defin'd in that most ancient Council: they not only Defin'd, using all the Terms and Phrases which could import Authoritative Defining (w) but they were the Sole Definers; and Presbyters had no more Interest in the Power of Definition than Deacons, nay than Laicks, who were present as well as Presbyters. And all this was highly reasonable: For 4, as I have shewn before by very many Arguments, Bishops by the Principles of those Times, had the Sovereign Power of Baptism: and the Case to be Determin'd in this Council was a Case about Baptism: who then besides the Bishops could have Right to determine in it? Neither was there any Prudential Necessity of the Opinions or Voices of Presbyters here, as sometimes there might have been in the Administration of a single Diocess. For in this, and all other Provincial Councils, there wanted not enough of Counsel, nor enough of Counsellors. There was no Fear of any

(w) Formulæ quibus utuntur fere hæc sunt, CENSEO (vox definitiva) Suff. 2, 8, 11, 16, 22, 31, 32, 33, 37, 41, 43, 72, 74, 83, 86. DECERNO Suff. 6, 38, 59. MEA SENTENTIA Suff. 9, 87. SE-CUNDUM MOTUM ANIMI MEI DICO. Suff. 73. EXISTIMO. Suff. 78.

single

single Man's determining any thing *Rashly* or *Unadvisedly*, as determining it by his own *Single Authority*: no: things were to be determined by *common Counsel*, and by *common Authority*, by the common Counsel of *many* who were Men of great *Experience*, and of long standing in the Church; of *many* whose *Merit*, and *Wisdom*, and *presumed Sufficiency* for such a *Station*, had *rais'd* them to the *Power* and *Dignity* of *Supreme Governours*, in their *Respective Churches*: And by *Consequence*; *many* who were to be *presum'd* to be best qualified for giving *proper* and *sound* and *seasonable Counsel*. And the same reason that made it equitable, that in this *Provincial Council*, *Bishops alone*, should have had the *Power* of *Definitive Voices*, viz. their having the *Sovereign Power* of *Baptism*, when thoroughly considered will likewise make it equitable, or reasonable; that is, it will clear it of all *Absurdity*, that they should have had the same *peculiar Interest*, the same *Sole Power* of *Defining* in all other Cases *Defineable* by *Provincial Synods*, in that all *Power* of Government Ecclesiastical (as G. R. himself (x) has not had Confidence to (x) Cyp. B. deny) is originally founded on the *Power* of the *Sacraments*. Exam. And who so has the *Supreme Power* of the *One Sacrament*, § 51. P. 75. must by necessary *Consequence* have it likewise of the *Other*. And so I come to consider what may be objected against what I have asserted, and I think demonstratively proved, and it is this for Substance.

THAT *Presbyters* were always present in *Provincial Synods*. § XXIV. That the *Roman Clergy* Ep. 30. and the *Roman Confessors* Ep. 31. do very clearly *Insinuate*, that by the *Customs* of those *Times* *Presbyters* were *consulted* in those *Synods*; and that *St. Cyprian* readily allowed of such a *Custom*. That *St. Cyprian*, very frequently, in his *Epistles* to his *Clergy*, tells them, such and such things shall be ordered, expedited and determined with their *Consent*, when he shall return to *Carthage*: That *Eusebius* tells us, there were present in the *Roman Council* convoked by *Cornelius*, besides *Bishops*, *many Presbyters* and *Deacons* (y). And *St. Cyprian* tells *Quintus*, that the *Bi-* (y) H.E. 1.6. *shops* which met in the first of the *Three Councils* convoked c. 43. for deciding the *Controversie* about *Heretical*, together with their *Fellow Presbyters*, determin'd so and so (z). And the *Re-* (z) Ep. 71. p. *records* of the famous *Council*, (as I have just now confessed 193. and accounted) which was the *Third* on that *Occasion*, do

(a) Cyp. B.
Exam.

§ 36. p. 48. 49.

(b) *ibid.* § 41.
p. 57.

§ XXV.

expressly bear that *Presbyters* were present. Nay, doth not *St. Cyprian*, in his Account of the Condemnation of *Felicissimus* and his Party, by an *African Synod*, plainly tell *Cornelius*, that *Presbyters* and *Deacons* [*assuerunt iudicio & cognitioni*] were present, and consented to the Sentence (a)? And what can be plainer than that which he writes to his *Presbyters* and *Deacons* Ep. 14? Doth he not tell them that *he could determine nothing, by himself, in the Case which some of his Presbyters had proposed to him? And that when he should return from his Secession, and they might meet together, they should, in common, consider and treat of Matters* [sic: *mutuus honor poscit*] *as their mutual Honour required? And what was this mutus Honor but that due Regard that he had to their Authority in the Church, and they ought to have to his? what less can it import than that it had been a Dishonouring of them, and setting them lower than Christ had set them in the Church, if he had manag'd her Affairs without them* (b)? This is the Force not only of all that hath been said by *G. R.* but all I can at present call to mind that can be objected, against the *Bishops sole Power of defining in Provincial Councils, in the Days of St. Cyprian: But the consideration of a few things will easily evacuate it; particularly,*

I. HOW easie is it to *distinguish* between being *present*, or being *consulted*; between being *Witnesses* of what passed, nay between being *allowed* to deliver their *Opinions*, or *represent* their *Reasons*, or *propose Overtures*, or *suggest Expedients*, &c. How easie is it to *Distinguish* between all these, or any thing like them, and the *privilege of a Definitive Suffrage*? Who knows not that there is a Notable, a Material difference between a *Voice deliberative*, and a *Voice decisive*? Can *G. R.* or any Man for him, shew so much as *one* instance, of a *Presbyter's* having a *definitive Suffrage* in any *one* of all those many *Provincial Councils*, which the *Cyprianic Age* afforded? Are not the *Records* of *one* of the greatest of them (as we have seen) plain, express, and peremptory to the Contrary? Or is it to be supposed, that the *Constitution* of that most Famous Council was *singular*, or *New*, or any way *receding* from the then *Current* and *Customary* constitution of *Provincial Councils*? What an advantage had those *African Fathers* given thereby to *Stephen*, and his party, if it had been so? Had *Those* been so inconsiderate as to have given *These* such

such an advantage: Certainly *these* would not have been so much wanting to their Cause, as not to have improved it as far as they could. Certainly St. *Austin*, in his Books concerning *Baptism* against the *Donatists*, wherein he particularly examines and studies to answer the *Suffrages* of this Council, would have readily objected against its *Authority*, that it had a *Substantial Nullity* in its *Constitution*: This *Nullity*, that *Presbyters* were not allowed to have their *Right* of *Definitive Voices* in it, if they had then *had* such a *Right*: And yet no such Syllable in all those Books, or in any Books of those earlier Ages. But what needs more? who can read the Monuments of the *Cyprianic Age*, without observing that there was never any Age, *nicer* or *stricter* about *Forms*? or had greater Prejudices or more cautious against *Innovations*? What I have said, though there were no more, might be abundantly sufficient to shew the weakness of all that was objected. And yet there is much more to be said. For,

2. NOTHING more observable than the *Difference* § XXVI. always made between the *Interests* of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* in those Councils, by the very *Style* and *Phrase* of the then Current Dialect: Thus St. *Cyprian*, in the very first Epistle, not only expressly distinguishes between his *Collegues* and *Presbyters*, but likewise he makes *Presbyters* no more than *Assessors* in the *Meetings* of *Bishops*. I and my COLLEGUES who were present, says he, and the *Presbyters* who were *Assessors* to us, were very much troubled, &c. (c) And the Inscription of the 4th. Epistle runs thus, *Cyprianus, Caelius, Victor, Sedatus, Tertullus, with the Presbyters who were* PRESENT. (d) An Inscription (as already (c) has been observed) taken notice of by *Salmasius*, as *emphatically* importing a *Signal Difference* between the *Interests* of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*. And no wonder, for who knows not that to have *Jurisdiction*, to have *Power* to *Define*, is *one thing*, and to be *only present* or *assistent* is *another*? Who knows not that the *Roman Presidents* of *Provinces* had their [*Assessores*] their *Assistants*, with whom they might *advise*, and whose *Counsel* they might *use* as they thought *expedient*, who yet had *no Power* to *Define* or *Determine*? Nay, is not this very ordinary, at this *Day*, in

(c) Gravior Commoti sumus Ego & COLLEGE MEI qui praesentes aderant, & C O M-PRESBYTERI Nostri qui Nobis ASSIDEBANT. Ep. I. p. 1. (d) Cyprianus &c. cum Presbyteris qui ADERANT.

&c. Ep. 4.

(c) Supra Cap. III. § XXIX.

E e e

all

all the *Meetings* of our *Royal Burghs*? Is there not *one Commissioner* who from his *Burgh* receives *Power* to *Vote*, and an *Assessor* sent along with him, only for *Advice*? And have we not had divers *Instances*, since the *Reformation*, of *Assistants* sent with the *Commissioners* from *Presbyteries*, to *General Assemblies*? This is certain; in the *Cyprianic* Dialect, to *Assist* can import, *no Parity* of *Power*: (which yet must be amongst those who have *equal Interest* and *Right* to *define* in *Councils*) for more than once we have *St. Cyprian* (or rather the *Scripture* itself, as cited by him) calling *Angels*, *God's Assistants*.

(f) Vide Tom. (f) And we have him using this Argument, to encourage the Faithful, cheerfully to suffer for Christ, that they shall ASSIST at his Side, when he sits to judge (g). And by what hath been said, it is easie to come by the true meaning of that which *St. Cyprian* says in his 71st. Epistle to *Quintus*: For it imports no more than that *Presbyters* were present and consented to, or approved that which the *Bishops* determined (h). And if it needed more Light it might have it plentifully.

TERE cum federit Judicaturus? De Exhort. Martyr. p. 183.

(h) De quare quid nuper in Concilio plurimi CO-EPI SC OPI cum Com-presbyteris qui A D E R A N T censuerimus, ut scires; Eiusdem Epistolæ exemplum tibi misi. Ep. 71. p. 193. Epistolam verò proculdubio intelligit Septuagesimam; XXXII Episcoporum, nullius vero Presbyteri nomine conscriptam.

§ XXVII.

3. FROM that very Passage cited and insisted on by *G. R.* from *Ep. 59* (55 by *C. Pamelinus's* reckoning) to prove the *Interest* of *Presbyters* in Provincial Synods: For if you take it altogether (as we ought to take Testimonies, unless we resolve to mistake them) nothing plainer than that *Presbyters* are entirely excluded, by it, from having had any *Definitive Voice* in the *Condemnation* of *Felicissimus*, &c. The *Act* of *JUDGING* is three or four times in it, most evidently appropriated to the *Bishops*; and they, as *Judges*, are most notoriously distinguished from the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, as being only *present*; as is obvious to any who considers the full account, as you have it on the Margent (i). Indeed a plainer Representation of the different *Privileges* and *Interests* of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* as well as any other *Clergy-men* in Provincial Councils is not to be wished.

(i) Oportet utique eos quibus (nos Episcopi) præsumus, non circumcurfare

(ut à Felicissimo ejusque satellitio facti) Nec EPISCOPORUM Concordiam coherentem sua subdola & fallaci temeritate collidere; sed agere illic causam suam ubi & accusatores habere & testes sui criminis possunt: NISI si paucis desperatis & perditis

tis minor videtur esse Auctoritas EPISCOPORUM in Africa constitutorum qui jam de illis JUDICAVERUNT, & eorum conscientiam multis delictorum laqueis vinctam JUDICII SUI nuper gravitate damnarunt. Jam causa eorum COGNITA est; (à nobis Episcopus in Africa constitutus) Jam de eis (Nostra Episcoporum) dicta sententia est: Nec CENSURÆ congruit SACERDOTUM (i. e. Episcoporum qui soli Censoria gaudebant potestate) Mobilis atque inconstantis animi levitate reprehendi, cum Dominus doceat & dicat, sit sermo vester, Est, Est, Non, Non: Si EORUM (Episcoporum) qui de illis priore anno JUDICAVERUNT Numerus, cum PRESBYTERIS & DIACONIS computetur (videri Presbyteros & Diaconos eodem jure in Synodis Provincialibus gravissos, utrosque vero ab Episcopis Judicibus accuratissime & quasi de industria discretos)? plures tunc AFFUERUNT Judicio & Cognitioni (affuerunt dumtaxat Presbyteri, quemadmodum & Diaconi: non judicaverunt, non cognoverunt, non Sententiam tulerunt, non damnaverunt, &c.) quam sunt eadem isti qui cum Fortunato nunc videntur esse conjuncti. Ep. 59. p. 136. 137.

4. AS for the Roman Council convoked by Cornelius, and mention'd by Eusebius (k). Nothing is plainer than that Bishops were the only Definers in it, if we compare Eusebius's and St. Cyprian's accounts of it. Eusebius says there was a great Council or Synod convoked at Rome, in which were present LX Bishops and a great many Presbyters and Deacons; and in other Provinces there were Synods of Pastors, that is Bishops (for so the word Ποιμήν always signifies in the Eusebian Dialect) who determin'd in the matter, and it agreed in one common Definition against the Novatians. So that he not only distinguishes between Bishops and Presbyters who were present at the Synod, for which it will be hard to find a Reason, if Presbyters acted in parity with Bishops in point of Definition; but he classes the Presbyters with the Deacons, who, 'tis certain could not claim the privilege of a Definitive Voice: And he mentions only Bishops as meeting in the other Provinces, and defining in the Controversie, without so much as a word of either Presbyter or Deacon; which, what less can it import, than that he deem'd it enough to mention those who had the power of Decision? And St. Cyprian mentioning that same Roman Synod, tells Antonianus, that Cornelius kept a Council with many Fellow Bishops, without so much as a syllable of either Presbyters or Deacons (l): Thinking it enough, no doubt, to mention those who had the Power of Defining.

§ XXVIII
(k) Ερ' ὡ συν-
ὁδὸν μεγίστην ἐ-
πὶ Ρώμης συν-
κροτηθεῖσιν,
ἐξήκοντα ἡν-
τ' ἀειμένον Ε-
πισκόπων, πλε-
όντων δ' ἐπὶ μάλ-
λον Πρεσβυτέ-
ρων καὶ Διακό-
νων ἰδίως τὸ
κατὰ τοιαύτας
ἐπαρχίας ἦν
καὶ ῥώσιν
ΠΟΙΜΕΝΩΝ
περὶ τῆ περὶ
τῆς Διακρίσε-
ως, ἀόγμα
παίσει, πῶς
πᾶσι, &c. Eu-
seb. H. E. L. 6.
C. 43.

(l) Ac si minus
sufficiens E-
PISCOPO-
RUM in A-
frica nume-
rus videbatur
etiam Romani
super hac re
scripsimus ad

Cornelium COLLEGAM nostrum qui & ipse cum PLURIMIS CO-EPISCOPIS habito CONCILIO in eundem NOBISCUM (Episcopis Africanis) Sententiam pari gravitate & salubri moderatione consensit Ep. 55. p. 103.

XXIX.

(m) Quamquam nobis in tam ingenti negotio placeat quod & tu ipse tractasti prius, Ecclesie pacem sustinendam: Deinde sic Collatione consiliorum cum Episcopis PRESBYTERIS DIACONIS, CONFESSORIBUS pariter ac STANTIBUS LACIS facta, Lapsum tractare Rationem Ep.

30. p. 59. vide paria Ep. 31. p. 63. & Ep. 20. p. 43. & Ep. 55. p. 102.

§ XXX.

(n) Fecerunt ad nos de quibusdam beati

Martyres Literas, petentes examinari desideria sua; cum, pace nobis omnibus à Domino prius data, ad Ecclesiam regredi cuperimus examinabuntur singula præsentibus & JUDICANTIBUS VOBIS. Ep. 17. p. 39.

5, The Evidences of the Power and Interest of Presbyters, in Provincial Synods, pretended to be contain'd in the Epistles written by the Roman Clergy and Confessors to St. Cyprian, bear their Answer in their own Basoms. You have them on the Margent (m); and in them expressly contain'd, that the Interest of Presbyters in such Synods was no more, not only than that of Deacons, but than that of Confessors and Laicks which had not lapsed. Will G. R. or any Man of common Sense, who pretends to adhere to the Presbyterian Principles, allow all Deacons, and all Confessors, and all unlapsing Laicks to have had Definitive Voices in Provincial Councils, in the Days of St. Cyprian? This in short, is enough to convince any sober Man, that G. R. can gain nothing by his having cited these Testimonies. But I know whom I have to deal with, and therefore, with the Readers allowance, let me put these two things beyond all future Controversie. First, that so far as we can learn from the Monuments of the Cyprianic Age, the Stantes Laici, the unlapsing Laicks, had as great an Interest in Provincial Councils, as Presbyters. And Secondly, that yet those Laicks were very far from having the Interest of a Definitive Suffrage.

FIRST, I say, for faras we can learn from the Monuments of the Cyprianic Age, unlapsing Laicks had as great an Interest in Provincial Councils, as Presbyters. St. Cyprian indeed seems sometimes to talk more highly concerning the Interest of the PLEBS, the Laity, than he does at any time concerning that of Presbyters, E. g. Ep. 17. He writes thus to the [Fratres in plebe consistentes,] those of the Laity who had not lapsed, that so soon as the Lord should restore Peace to the Church, and he might safely return from his Retirement, they should not only be present but also be JUDGES, when the Case of the Lapsers, and the Petitions of the Martyrs should come to be examined (n). And Ep. 43. written to all his People [Plebi Universe] he not only tells them that the Five Presbyters, &c.

who

who sided with *Felicissimus*, and separated from the Church, had long before deserved to be excommunicated, according to their *Suffrages* (o); but also that when it shall please God so to order matters, as that he and his *Collegues* can meet together, all matters shall be determined according to their *ARBITRIMENT* (p). And *Ep* 44. he tells *Cornelius*, how *Novatianus's* Missionaries had come to *Carthage*, and most earnestly demanded, that the Crimes they had to charge the same *Cornelius* with, and they affirmed they could prove, might be *COGNOSCED* of by him and his [Plebs] his people, without so much as naming any of the Clergy, Presbyters, or others (q). Nay, *Ep* 34. Written to his Presbyters and Deacons, when he comes to tell them how *Philumenus* and *Fortunatus* and *Favorinus* should be judged, quite omitting them in an Epistle, as I said, written to themselves, he says, that the Matter shall be treated of, and considered with his Collegues, and with all the People (r). Let *G. R.* search over the whole Monuments of the *Cyprianic Age*, if he will, and let him shew me such Five Testimonies concerning the Interest of Presbyters if he can. Neither is this all. For,

(o) Soli cum Episcopis non sint qui contra Episcopos rebellant: Conjuratōnis suæ Pœnas soli subeant qui olim secundum VESTRA SUFFRAGIA. Conjuratōnis & Malignitatis suæ sententiam subire meruerunt.

Ep 43. p. 84.
(p) Persecutionis istius novissima hæc est & extrema tentatio, quæ & ipsa cito

Domino protegente transibit, ut representer vobis, post paschæ diem cum *COLLEGIS MEIS*, quibus præsentibus secundum *ARBITRIUM* quoque *VESTRUM*, & omnium nostrum commune Consilium, sicut semel placuit, ea quæ agenda sunt disponere pariter & limare poterimus. *Ep* 43. p. 85.

(q) Qui (à *Novationo nempe missi*) cum in statione invidiosis quoque Convitiis & Clamoribus turbulentis proruerent, & flagitarent, ut Crimina quæ se afferre ac probare dicebant, publice à *NOBIS* & à *PLEBE COGNOSCERENTUR* &c. *Ep* 44. p. 85.

(r) Desideratis quoque ut de *Philumeno* & *Fortunato Hypodiaconis* & *Favorino Acolytho*, qui medio tempore recesserunt, & nunc venerunt, quod mihi videatur rescribam. Cui rei non potui me solum Judicem dare, cum multi adhuc de clero absentes sint, nec locum suum vel sero repetendum putaverunt, & hæc singulorum tractanda sit & limanda plenius ratio, non tantum cum *COLLEGIS MEIS*, sed & cum *PLEBE IPSA UNIVERSA*. *Ep* 34. p. 68.

EVEN that celebrated Passage *Ep* 14. insisted on by § XXXI. *G. R.* (s) (and commonly by all those of his party) for asserting the Interest of Presbyters in the Management of Ecclesiastical Government, seems obviously to make as much, if not more for the Interest of the *PLEBS*, the Laity. I have already considered it in part, and shewn, to a Demonstration, that it contains no more but a voluntary and obli-

ging

(s) § 41. p. 57.

(t) Supra
§ VII.

(u) Ad id ve-
ro quod
scripserunt
mihi Donatus
& Fortunatus,
Novatus &
Gordius. Solus
nihil rescribere
potui quan-
do à Primor-
dio Episcopa-
tus mei Sta-
tuerim nihil
sine CONSI-
LIO VES-
TRO (P.P. &
D.D.) & sine
CONSENSU
PLEBIS mea
privatim sen-
tentia gerere,
sed cum ad vos
per Dei Gra-
tiam venero,
tunc de eis
quæ vel Gestæ
sunt vel Ge-
renda SICUT
MUTUUS
HONOR
POSCIT, in
Commune
tractabimus.
&c. Ep. 14. p. 33.
(v) Hoc enim
& verecun-
diæ & Disci-
plinæ & Vitæ
omnium no-
strum conve-
nit ut propo-
siti cum clero convenientes, præsentæ & Stantium plebe quibus & ipsis pro fide & ti-
mere suo HONOR HABENDUS est, disponere omnia Consilii communis religione
possimus. Ep. 19. p. 42.

ging Condescension of our Martyrs, to whomsoever it was made (t). That which I say now is, that the *People* are as *much*, if not *more* regarded in it than *Presbyters*. For making this appear, let us consider it over again, and more fully than we did before. You have our Martyr's Words on the Margent (u) and it is to this purpose: *As to that which my Fellow-Presbyters, Donatus and Fortunatus, &c. wrote to me, I could not by my self return an answer; seeing when first I entered to my Bishoprick, I determined to do nothing of mine own private Opinion, nor without your Advice and the Consent of my People: But when by God's Grace I shall return, then, we shall in common consider what has been, or what is to be done, [Sicut (not Sic, as G. R. has it, to the perverting of the Sense) mutuus honor poscit] as mutual Honour requires.* In which words (I say it over again) the *People* seem to be as *much*, if not *more*, regarded than the *Presbyters*. My Reasons are these: 1. 'Tis no more but the *Advice* of the *Presbyters* that is here reckoned upon; but it is the *Consent* of the *People*: Now who knows not that *Consent* imports a *greater Interest* than *Advice*. I may ask *ones Advice*, and hear what he has to say, and yet not listen to it, but follow mine own Inclinations, *Counsel*, as we say, *is no Command*. But when I say, I shall do nothing without *ones Consent*, it is plain, that I bind up my Hands from doing any thing in the *Matter*, without that *ones Consent* be granted. 2. St. Cyprian, in another Epistle, seems fairly to restrict the [*Mutuus Honor*] to the *People*: at least he speaks of it (and 'tis to his P.P. and D.D. too) as *due* to them; when he neither says nor insinuates any such thing to be *due* to his Clergy. *It is agreeable to the Modesty, the Discipline, and the Conversation of all of us* (says he) *that we the Bishops, with our Clergy, should meet, the PLEBS STANTIAM, the Multitude of the Laity, which has not lapsed, to whom, for their Faith and Religion, such HONOUR OUGHT TO BE PAID, being also present; and that so we should order all things with common Advice* (v). Here, I say, to be present in provincial Synods, where things are to be ordered by *common Advice*, is mentioned as an *Honour due* to the *People*; and no such thing is

said

said concerning even *Presbyters*. Neither can it be rationally supposed, that it was carelessly or inadvertently said, considering how exactly it agrees with what has been discoursed in the preceeding Section.

THUS as I have said, if we take things strictly and literally, and without all Allowances of Latitude, the *People* seem to have been *more* regarded than *Presbyters* themselves, in the *Constitution* of *Provincial Councils*. But it is enough for my purpose, if they were as *much*. And here again I might adduce many more Testimonies to prove at least, their *equal Interest*. For example, are we not told, *Ep. 4.* that it was as much the concern of the *People* as the *Præpositi*, the *Rulers*, to maintain the vigour of *Discipline* (w)? And *Ep. 8.* that it was as much *Incumbent on them*, as on *Presbyters*, to watch over the *Flock* (x)? Nay, doth not our Martyr recommend it to them to *rule* and *temper* the Immorigerous and Exorbitant, who had not been sufficiently instructed and restrained by his *Presbyters* (y)? Twenty more such Passages might be adduced to this purpose (z). But this time we have had enough in Confirmation of the first thing proposed, viz. that the *Stantes Laici* had as great an *Interest* in *Provincial Councils* as *Presbyters* themselves. And yet,

(w) Primo igitur loco F. C. & P R Æ-POSITIS & PLEBI nihil aliud elaborandum est, quam ut qui Deum timeamus cum omni observatione Disciplina præcepta te-

neamus, nec errare Fratres nostros & pro Arbitrio & Rustu suo vivere &c. *Ep. 4. p. 7.*

(x) Salutant vos Fratres qui sunt in vinculis, & PRESBYTERI & TOTA ECCLESIA quæ & IPSA cum summa sollicitudine EXCUBAT pro omnibus qui invocant Nomen Domini. *Ep. 8. p. 18. P. P. & D D. Romanorum ad P P. & D D. Carthaginenses est hæc Epistola.*

(y) Vos quidam (*Fratres in plebe consistentes alloquitur*) Nostri Presbyteri & Diaconi monere debuerant, ut commendatas sibi oves foverent, & divino Magisterio ad viam deprecandæ salutis instruerent. Ego plebis nostræ & quietem novi pariter & Timorem qui in Satisfactione Dei & Deprecatione vigilarent, nisi eos quidam de Presbyteris Gratiificantes decepissent. Vel vos itaque singulos REGITE, & Consilio ac Moderatione vestra, & secundum divina præcepta Laplorum animos TEMPERATE. *E. 17. p. 39.*

(z) Vide *Ep. 59. p. 139.*

SECONDLY, the *People* had no *Definitive Suffrages* in § XXXIII. *Provincial Councils*. I know, our *Presbyterian Brethren* are so far from being obliged by the true and genuine Principles of *Presbytery*, to say, *they had*, that they cannot say it without going counter to those Principles. But it is nothing extraordinary to observe people on many occasions, for

forgetful of Principles : And the Principles of some other *Sects* (of all those who lodge all *Church Power* originally in the *People*) do lead them to assert such a *popular Right* : some do hotly contend for it, and therefore it shall not be much amiss briefly to discourse this matter, so far as the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age* can afford us any Light. And,

§ XXXIV.

I. TO me it seems a shrewd Presumption against the *Peoples Right* to a *definitive Voice* in Provincial Councils in the Days of *St. Cyprian*, if in those Days they had not the *Right* of an *Elective Voice* in the *Promotion* of their *Bishops*. It must be so obvious to any Man of common Sense that the *Plebs*, the *common People*, were every way as unfitted and unqualified, if not more, for the one as for the other, that it needs not be insisted on : all therefore necessary to be insisted on is this Question, whether *Bishops* in *St. Cyprian's* time were formally *elect*ed by the *People* ? Now considering the frequent accounts we have of the *Promotions* of *Bishops*, in those Times ; and sometimes of hot Contentions about them enough, it must be very strange, if the *People* had a *Power* or *Right* to *Chuse* them, and yet no Evidences, nay, nor Intimations of such a *Power* at all *Discoverable*. It may pass therefore for Argument sufficient against the *Peoples Right* to *elect* their *Bishops*, if it can be reasonably maintained that there is no sufficient Evidence that they had such a *Right* : Much more if it can be made appear, that there is good and solid Argument against their having had it : And I think I have reason to affirm both. I. Then, I say, no sufficient Evidence of the *Peoples Right* to *elect* their *Bishops* can be discovered in the Monuments of the *Cyprianic Age*. I have observed only two Shadows of Argument for it ; and they are but Shadows, if they are so much. One is, that *St. Cyprian* says of both himself and *Cornelius*, that they were promoted to their *Bishopricks* by the *Suffrage* of the *People*. The other, that in a *Synodical Epistle* (the 67th. among *St. Cyprian's*) it is said, that *the People have a power of chusing worthy and refusing unworthy Bishops*. But there is no such Force in either, as may be sufficient to infer the Conclusion.

§ XXXV.

NOT in the first: All the Force of it lies in the Word [*Suffragium*] which is indeed no Force at all. For I do not remember that this Word stands so in any Sentence, in all the

the Cyprianic Monuments, as that it must necessarily signify an *Elective Voice*: But I have observed it divers times used where it cannot signify it. E. g. our Martyr, in his learned Discourse, *Of the Vanity of Idols*, insisting on the Barbarities which had been committed even in *Rome*, in the first *Formations* of its *Greatness*, particularly Instances in *Brutus*, one of the first *Consuls*, who kills his own Sons, says he, [*ut crescat de SUFFRAGIO sceleris commendatio Dignitatis*] (a). That the Commendation or Credit of his Dignity may be rais'd by the Suffrage of a Crime. This I think doth not look very like an *Elective Vote*. Again, in that same Work, discoursing how unworthily the *Jews* treated our Redeemer, he says, they delivered him to *Pontius Pilate* the Roman Governour [*Crucemque & Mortem SUFFRAGIIS violentis & pertinacibus flagrantibus*] (b). Most earnestly demanding his Crucifixion and Death by their violent and obstinate Suffrages. The meaning is plainly no more, at most, than that they urged *Pilate* by furious and redoubled Addresses or Intreaties: For it is certain *Pilate* did never put it to a *Vote*; never referred it to a *Polling*, whether our Saviour should die or not. So likewise in his notable Discourse concerning *Envy and Malice*, having accounted how *David* slew *Goliath*, he says, the people admired him for it, and he expresses it thus [*Populus admirans in laudes David predicationis SUFFRAGIO profusit*] (c). The People in a fit of Admiration, bursted out into a Suffrage of Commendation, &c. And Ep. 38. Representing how God by a special Manifestation of his Will had separated *Aurelius* to be a Clergyman, he chuses to word it thus [*Sed expectanda non sunt Testimonia humana cum precedunt divina SUFFRAGIA*] (d) that is plainly neither more nor less, than that there is no need of human Testimonies where God interposes with a special Designation. And Ep. 73. He introduces himself to his Explication of *Phil. i. 18.* thus [*Quod enim quidam dicunt quasi ad Hæreticorum SUFFRAGIUM pertineat quod dixerit Apostolus*] (e). The plain Sense is, that *St. Paul's* Words can make nothing for the Establishment or Validity of Baptism administered by Hereticks. No Man, I think, will say that ever *St. Cyprian* dream'd that there had been a formal Convocation of the Clergy or the People, or both; and the Matter had been voted, and *St. Paul's* Vote was, that Heretical Baptisms were

valid. It were easie likewise to shew, that in the *Cyprianit* Dialect the Verb [*Suffragor*] seldom or never signifies to *Vote*, nor the Noun [*Suffragator*] a *Voter*: But what I have adduced is sufficient to shew, that the Term [*Suffragium*] need not, ought not to be taken for an *Electional Vote*, if I may so call it, unless the Scope and Tendency of the Discourse where it is used, necessarily require it to be so taken. Now,

§ XXXVI.

(f) Factus est
autem Corne-
lius Episco-
pus de Dei &
Christi ejus
JUDICIO, &
de Clericorum
pene omnium
TESTIMO-
NIO, de PLE-
BIS quæ tunc
adfuit SUF-
FRAGIO &
de Sacerdoti
antiquorum
& bonorum
virorum COL-
LEGIO Ep.
55. p. 104.

NO such Necessity in any of those Places where the Pro-
motion of either *Cornelius* or *St. Cyprian* is discoursed of, *E. g.*
what we read in Ep. 55. concerning *Cornelius*, that he was
made Bishop of *Rome*, by the Designation of God and his Christ,
by the Testimony of almost all the Clergy, by the SUFFRAGE,
of all the People who were then present, and by the College of
ancient Bishops and excellent Men (f). There is no imaginable
Necessity of taking the *Suffrage* of the People to signify their
electing him by their Votes to be their Bishop. The Testimo-
ny goes every whit as smoothly and naturally; and much
more appositely, if we understand no more by it than their
Approbation or *Good-liking*. For, if (as was ordinary in those
Days and had been signally exemplify'd in the Promotion
of his Predecessor *Fabianus*) God by some special Manifestation
of his Will had pointed out *Cornelius* to be Bishop of *Rome*,
how could it have been referred to a *Vote* of the People, whe-
ther they would have him to be their Bishop or no? If it
was so, had it not been as reasonable to say, in the Instance of
Cornelius, as we have heard our Martyr said, in the Instance
of *Aurelius* [*Expectanda non sunt Testimonia humana cum præ-
cedant divina Suffragia?*] Nay, suppose no more to be import-
ed by the [*Judicium Dei*] but God's *Approbation* of *Cornelius's*
Promotion, Colligible from the *Qualifications* wherewith he
was *Endowed*, the *Regularity* of his *Advancement*, and the
remarkable *Unanimity* of those who were concern'd to have
him their Bishop: Suppose it to import no more, I say, but
the *Countenance* of the *Ordinary Providence* of God, yet still
there is no Necessity of giving the People a *Vote* in his *Election*.
The *Interest* of the Clergy, all things considered, was without
doubt as great as the *Interest* of the People in the *Election* of
a Bishop; and yet you see, all, the Clergy did, was to give a
good Testimony of him. And can we imagine that the Peo-
ple could do more? But let *St. Cyprian* himself determine the

Mat,

Matter; who, Ep. 68. tells us, that *Cornelius* was ordained Bishop of Rome, by the Appointment of God, and the SUFFRAGE of the Clergy and People (g); which fairly gives us to understand, that *Suffrage* and *Testimony* were two different Words to signify the same thing: And no more is meant, but that *Cornelius* had the *Testimony* and *Approbation* of both Clergy and People. Neither Clergy nor People objected any thing against his Abilities, or his Life and Conversation: Both were very well pleased to have him their Bishop.

(g) Episcopo Cornelio in Catholica Ecclesia de DE JUDICIO, & CLERI ac PLEBIS SUFFRAGIO ordinato. Ep. 68. p. 177.

THE Approbation and Good-liking of the People, is also all that can be made of their *Suffrage* in the Promotion of St. Cyprian. Thus when he says Ep. 59. That if God's Institutions were observed, none would make any Stir against the College of Bishops; and no Man, after the Divine Appointment and the Suffrage of the People, and the consent of his Fellow-Bishops, would make himself Judge, not of the Bishop, but of God (h): It is plain that he makes the *Judicium Dei*, God's Designation, the great Cause of his Promotion. And by Consequence, that the *Suffrage* of the People can necessarily import no more but their Approbation and Satisfaction. And when again, in that same Ep. he says concerning himself, that he was chosen in a peaceable time by the Suffrage of all the People (i). Who sees not that the meaning may fairly, and without any Force, be, (not that he was chosen by their Votes, but) that he was chosen by their Approbation and Applause, their Joy and their Good-liking? To the same Sense of Acquiescence or Approbation or Good-liking, is that Passage in Ep. 43. interpretable, where resenting the Undutifulness of *Felicissimus*, and the Five Presbyters who sided with him, he says to his People, that those Rebels were mindful of their Conspiracy, and retain'd their old Venom against his Promotion to the Bishoprick, and the Suffrage of the People, and the Determination of God (k). Indeed this of Approbation or Good-liking is the most ordinary Sense in which the Word was then used. Thus, when *Cornelius*, in his *Infermatory* Epistle to Cyprian, concerning the Return of *Maximus*, *Urbanus*, *Sidonius*, *Macarius*, &c. to the Unity of the Church, says, he restored *Maximus* being a Presbyter to his former Station, and received the rest with a

§ XXXVII.

(h) Cui (Episcopo sive uni Judici) si secundum Magisteria divina obtemperaret fraternitas universa, Nemo adversum SACERDOTUM COLLEGIUM quidquam moveret; nemo post Divinum JUDICIUM, post POPULI SUFFRAGIUM, (post Co episcoporum CONSENSUM) Judicem se non jam Episcopi sed Dei faceret. Ep. 59. p. 129.

(i) Quando Episcopus in locum defuncti substituitur, quando populi universi SUFFRAGIO in pace deligitur. Ep. 59. p. 130.

(k) Conjuratōnis suæ Memores & antiqua illa contra Episcopatum meum, imo contra SUFFRAGIUM vestrum & Dei JUDICIUM venena retinente Ep. 43. p. 82.

(l) Maximum
Presbyterum
locum suum
agnoscere ius-
simus ceteros
cum INGEN-
TI POPULI
SUFFRA-
GIO recepi-
mus. Ep. 49.
p. 93.

great Suffrage of the People (l). 'Tis unquestionable, that no more is meant than the Peoples Joy and Good liking. To interpret it to as if it had been put to a *Vote* of the People, whether they should or should not have been received, is not only plainly contrary to the *Grain* of the Epistle, whereby we are told that the whole Matter was *Concerted* and *Disgested* before it was *communicated* to the People, and that the People were only *convocated* to be *Witnesses* of the *Reception* of those who return'd from the *Schism*; but also the very Sound of the Words of *Cornelius* refuses such a *Sense*: It being impossible, without a mighty Violence, to bend the [INGENS Populi Suffragium] to the *Sense* of a *Popular Vote*. And besides these Arguments against it, *St. Cyprian*, who doubtless did very well understand the Customs of those times, has interpreted *Cornelius's* Phrase entirely to the *Sense* of Joy and Gladness for the Return of those who had gone astray, it being a Return, to all good Christians, most Refreshful and Com-

(m) Merito fortorable (m).
illos revertentes summo ut scribis (*Cornelius* alloquitur) GAUDIO (en quod sibi volebat Populi Suffragium) & Clerus & Plebs & Fraternitas Univerſa excepit, quoniam in Confessio-
nis Gloriam suam conservantibus & ad Unitatem revertentibus nemo non Socium se & Participem eorum Gloriæ computabat. Ep. 51. p. 95.

§ XXXVIII. To the same *Sense* of *Cheerful Acceptance* and *Cardinal Approbation*, may be fairly interpreted all that *Pontius* has, concerning the Behaviour of the People at the Promotion of our Martyr to his Bishoprick. He says, *He was chosen by the divine Designation, and the Favour, not the formal and stated Vote, of the People*: That the People, by *Divine Inspiration* (as it were) manifested a *singular Love* to him, and *Honour* for him: That they were mightily *Alarm'd* and *Agast* upon the News of his *Abſcending*, as being *unwilling* to be their *Bishop*: That, on that occasion, *Great numbers* of them besieged the *Doors* of his *House*, and others went the round about all the *Avenues* to *prevent* his *Escape*. That they *waited* for his *appearing*, with *great Sollicitude*, and *received* him when he came

(n) Judio with an Excess of joy (n). But who sees not that all this might
Dei & Favore
Plebis ad Officium Sacerdotii & Episcopatus Gradum electus est in Dilectionem ejus
& honorem totus Populus adspirante (al. inspirante) Domino profilit. Humiliter
ille secessit. Quo tunc Ardore Plebs æstuans fluctuabat, flagitabat, requirebat. Ob-
federat fores domus copiosa fraternitas, & per omnes aditus sollicita Caritas circuibat.
Erat videre ceteros omnes suspensos, anxio Spiritu expectare venturum, cum Gaudio
nimio excipere venientem. Pontius in vita Cyp. p. 3. have

have been without their having had any *Right*, any *Power*, any *Privilege*, any *Authority*, to *elect* him by their *Formal* and *Stated Votes*? There is here Argument enough indeed of their *Zeal* and *Concern* to have him for their Bishop. But *Zeal*, or *Favour*, or *Concern* is one thing, and *Power*, or *Right* to *chuse* is *another*. And so much at present for shewing the Weakness of the first Argument I named, that might be pretended to be found in the Monuments of the *Cyprianic Age* for the *Peoples Right* of *choosing* their Bishops.

ALL things duly considered, the other is as destitute of Force. The Case, in short, was this; *Basilides* a *Spanish Bishop*, in the Days of Persecution, had fallen into the dreadful Sin of Idolatry; and falling sick, he had blasphemed God, as he himself had confessed: The Conscience of these odious Crimes had moved him to lay down his Bishoprick, of his own Accord; and stand among the Penitents, and confess he should meet with great Favour if ever he should be restored even to Lay-Communion; and there was already another, *Sabinus*, Canonically chosen and ordain'd Bishop in his room; and actually in the Possession of the Chair, and the Administration of the Government. The Persecution abated: It repented *Basilides* that he had abdicated; and being very earnest to be restored, he had studied all Arts that might facilitate his Reposition. Particularly, besides divers other Bishops to whom he had applied for being allowed their Communion as a Bishop, he had gone to *Rome*, and so far imposed on *Stephen*, then Bishop of that City, as that he had got from him the right Hand of Fellowship, and engaged him to interpose for his Restitution. This brought the People of the *Diocese* into a great Perplexity, and obliged them to write to *Africa*, for advice how to behave in such a Difficulty. XXXVII *African* Bishops meet in Council, and form a Synodical Epistle, wherein, having adduced divers Arguments and Authorities to determine the People which had wrote to them, to oppose the Restitution of *Basilides*, who had so notoriously forfeited his Title; and to adhere to *Sabinus* as their only Rightful Bishop; they sum up all in this general Conclusion, *That a People, obedient to the Precepts of our Lord, and fearing God, ought to separate themselves from a scandalous Bishop, and not pollute themselves with the Sacrifices of a sacrilegious Priest, seeing without Question, they had it in their Power to CHUSE wor-*
thy

§ XXXIX.

(o) Propter
quod PLEBS
obsequens
præceptis Do-
minicis &
Deum metu-
ens, à pecca-
tore P R Æ-
P O S I T O
separare se
debet, nec se
ad Sacrilegi
Sacerdotis Sa-
crificia mis-
cere; quando
IPSA maximè
habeat PO-
T E S T A-
T E M vel
ELIGENDI
dignos Sacer-
dotes, vel in-
dignos recu-
sandi Ep. 67.
(Pamelio 68)
p. 171.

(p) Nec sibi
Plebs blandia-
tur quasi immunis esse à Contagio delicti possit, cum Sacerdote peccatore Communicans,
& ad injustum atque illicitum P R Æ P O S I T I sui Episcopatum consensum suum
commodans. *ibid.*

(q) Ad poenam veniunt non tantum qui mala faciunt, sed etiam qui talia agentibus
consentiunt; Qui dum malis & peccatoribus & poenitentiam non agentibus illicita
Communicatione miscentur, Nocentium contactibus polluuntur, & dum junguntur in
Culpa, sic nec in poena separantur. p. 173.

§ XL.

THAT that which I have given is the true Sense and Fur-
port of the afore-cited Passage, will be farther evident when
we consider, that it is this very same Epistle, and in the very
next subjoined Periods, that affords us plain and strong
and solid Argument against the People's having (in those
Days) the Right of choosing their own Bishops; and that all
their Interest was giving of Testimony to their Life and Con-
versation. The Bishops who wrote the Epistle, do indeed insist
on this Popular Interest, as very necessary: But then
they do so insist on it, as makes it evident, that the People
had no more allowed them. They insist on three Scripture
Pre-

Precedents for it. The first is, that *Moses* (Num. 20. 25. &c.) was commanded to install Eleazar in the Priesthood before the whole Congregation. The Second, that when an Apostle was to be substituted in the Room of Judas, St. Peter (Act. 1. 15.) stood up in the midst of the Disciples, &c. From these Precedents they infer, that a Bishop ought to be ordained in Presence of the People. Why? Because he was to be chosen by the Votes of the People? Who can imagine that St. Cyprian and his Colleagues were such Dunces, as not to have known, that neither Eleazar nor Matthias was chosen by Popular Voices? But what needs more? Nothing plainer, than that all they adduced those Precedents for, was, that the Election and Ordination of a Bishop ought to be performed [*Plebe presente*] and [*Sub omnium oculis*] and [*non nisi sub populi Assistentis Conscientia*] That is, before a solemn Meeting of the People: And they do most distinctly determine this Popular Interest, by assigning the Reason of it to be no other, than that he who was to be ordained, might be approved by publick Tryal and Testimony. And, that the People being present, the Crimes of the Wicked might be detected, or the Merits of the Vertuous published, and so the Ordination might be lawful and accountable, being examined with the Approbation and Judgment of all.

(7) But the third Precedent is the most considerable. It is that of the Election and Ordination of the Seven Deacons recorded, Act. 6. A Precedent which might indeed have given some Countenance to Popular Elections, if the Synod had had a mind to assert them. But is it not adduced for this end? So far from it, that they seem deliberately to have avoided it. for all the Use they make of the Precedent, is exactly the same, and neither more nor less than what they made of the other two Precedents, namely, *Simple Testimony*, as appears from the Words on the Margent (s). Neither is this all. For,

[(r) Ut Sacerdos PLEBE PRÆSENTE sub omnium oculis deligatur & dignus atque idoneus publico iudicio ac TESTIMONIO comprobetur. Non nisi sub

populi assistentis conscientia fieri oportere Ordinationes ut Plebe presente vel dereguntur Malorum Crimina vel bonorum Merita prædicentur, & sit Ordinatio justa & legitima quæ omnium Suffragio & Iudicio fuerit examinata Ep. 67. p. 172.

(s) Nec hoc in Episcoporum tantum & Sacerdotum, sed in Diaconorum Ordinationibus observasse Apostolos animadvertimus, de quo & ipso in Actis eorum scriptum est, & convocarunt, inquit illi duodecim totam Plebem Discipulorum & dixerunt eis. Quod utique iccirco tam diligenter & caute convocata plebe tota gerebatur, nequis ad Altaris ministerium, vel ad Sacerdotalem locum indignus Obreperit. Ibid quæ verba manifestissime ad Testimonium pertinent, nulla vero vi ad vocem quam vocant Electivam aptari possunt. Ibid.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

HAVING gone through those Instances, and for no other end than I have shew'd, they proceed next to give a plain and positive Account of the manner of promoting Bishops in those times. *It is diligently to be observed, as descending from Divine Tradition and Apostolic Practice, and it is actually observed with us (in Africa) and generally in all Provinces, that for celebrating Ordinations aright, all the Neighbouring Bishops of the Province, do meet where the People are, whose Bishop is to be ordained, and that he be chosen in the Presence (not by the Votes) of the People, who most perfectly knows every Man's Life, and has observed his Behaviour by his Conversation: Which course also we perceive hath been observed with you (in Spain) in the Ordination of our Colleague Sabinus, who has been promoted to the Bishoprick with the Suffrage (Approbation, Commendation, or Good-liking) of the Fraternity, and by the Judgment of the Bishops who were present (t).* Here, I say, we have a plain account of Episcopal Promotions in the Days of St. Cyprian. The neighbouring Bishops of the Province met, in the City that wanted a Bishop; and elected, ordained, and admitted into their College, such a Man as they judg'd most proper for the Office. And this they did in Presence of the People met in full Congregation, because the People were the best Witnesses of his Life and Conversation.

(t) Propter quod diligenter de traditione divina & Apostolica observatione servandum est & tenendum quod apud nos quoque & fere per universas Provincias tenetur, ut ad Ordinationes rite celebrandas ad eam plebem cui Praepositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem Provinciae proximi quique convenient, & Episcopus deligatur PLEBE PRÆSENTE quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit & uniuscujusque Actum de ejus conversatione perspexit. Quod & apud vos factum videmus in Sabini Collegæ nostri Ordinatione, ut de universæ fraternitatis SUFFRAGIO & de Episcoporum qui in præsentia convenerant JUDICIO, Episcopatus & deferretur &c. Ep. 67. p. 172.

§ XLII.

DIVERS other things are observable in this Memorable Passage; such as 1. That it has been the *Belief* of this *African Council*, that *Episcopacy* was of *Divine Institution*, of which more hereafter. 2. That the *Combinations* of *Bishops* into *Provincial Societies* was of the *same Original*. And 3. Whereas they say [*fere*] *almost in all Provinces*, Enquiry might be made into the Reason of such a Limitation, and whether it be probable that it was upon the account of *Alexandria*; which, as St. *Jerom* tells us, had something singular in the Promotion of its *Bishops*; namely, *that they were chosen by the*

the Presbyters. But I shall not at present discourse these Matters. Only, let me add, that *Origen* (St. Cyprian's Contemporary) on *Lev. 8. 4.* accords most exactly with our Provincial Synod. *Although the Lord* (says he) *had laid down Rules about the Instalment of the High Priest, and had chosen him, yet the Congregation is convoked. For in the Ordination of a Priest (or Bishop) the PRESENCE of the People is necessary, that all may know assuredly, that he, who, of all the People, is the excellentest, the learnedest, the holiest, and the eminentest for all Vertue, is the Person chosen to the Priesthood: And this is done, THE PEOPLE STANDING BY,* that there may be no room left for *After-retractions* or *Scruples*: *And this is that which the Apostle commands in the Ordination of a Bishop, saying, he must have a good Testimony from these that are without, &c. (w).* Thus, I say, (as the afore-mention'd *African Council*, so) *Origen* ascribes no more to the People, but *Presence* and *Testimony*, and that for the sake of *this*: Not one Syllable of the People's *Elective Vote*, unless it be, that it is fairly excluded by the whole Grain and Tendency of the Discourse. Let me farther add *Lampri- dius's* account of the order of the Emperor *Alexander Severus*, (Contemporary with *Origen*) to be observ'd in the Promotion of Persons to the Civil Government of Provinces, &c. *He published their Names* (says the Historian) *exhorting the People, that if any had any Crime to object against the Persons, he might make it appear by evident proof, under pain of Capital Punishment, if he did not prove it: Giving this Reason for it, that seeing both Christians and Jews used thus to proclaim such as were to be ordain'd Priests, it was hard that the same Course should not be observed concerning the Governours of Provinces, to whom Mens Lives and Fortunes were committed (u).* Can any

(w) Licet Dominus de Constituendo Pontificæ præcipisset, & Dominus elegisset, tamen Convocatur & Synagoga. Requiritur enim in Ordinando SACERDOTE & PRÆSENTIA POPULI, ut sciant omnes & certi sint quia qui Præstantior est ex omni populo, qui

Doctior, qui Sanctior, qui in omni virtute Eminentior, ille eligitur ad Sacerdotium; & hoc ADSTANTE POPULO ne qua post modum Retractatio cuicumque, nequis Scrupulus resideret. Hoc est autem quod & Apostolus præcepit in Ordinatione Sacerdotis, dicens. Oportet autem illum & TESTIMONIUM habere bonum ab his qui foris sunt, &c.

(u) Ubi aliquos voluisset vel Rectores provinciis dare, vel præpositos facere, vel procuratores, i. e. Rationales Ordinare, nomina eorum proponebat, hortans populum ut si quis quid haberet criminis probaret manifestis rebus; si non probasset, subiret pœnam capitis: Dicebaturque grave esse quum id Christiani & Judæi facerent in Prædicandis Sacerdotibus qui Ordinandi sunt, non fieri in Provinciarum Rectoribus quibus & Fortunæ hominum committerentur & Capita. *Lamprid. Alex. Sever. Cap. 45.*

p. 997. Edit. Lugd. Batav. An. 1671.

Man desire a clearer Commentary on the above-cited Testimonies of the *African Council* and *Origen*? will any Man say, that in this Emperor's time, the Governours of Provinces, &c. were promoted by *Popular Elections*? Is it not most certain (nay evident, even from the Words of *Lampridius*) that all allowed to the People, in such Promotions, was *Testimony*? And was not this allowed them in *Imitation* of the *Christians* in their *Promotions* of their *Bishops*.

§ XLIII.

(v) p. 13. 14.
15. 16. Resp.
ad O. B. 8.

(x) Alt. Da-
maf p. 332.

MUCH more might have been collected to this purpose, from divers Authors, who lived before St. *Cyprian's* time. But it is only the *Cyprianic Age* I am at present concern'd in: And what I have adduc'd is enough to shew, that the Fathers of that Age did very little believe, that the *Power* of choosing their own *Pastors*, was a *Right*, a *Grant*, a *Legacy* of our *Saviours*, left to the People; a *Privilege* belonging to them, as they are *Christ's Disciples*, as G. R. calls it, in his *True Representation of Presbyterian Government* (v), such a *Legacy* as the People can no more transfer nor alienate than they can their part of *Heaven*, as *Carrwright*, cited by *Calderwood*, and approved too (x) would have it. No such *Legacy* did those Fathers (I say) believe to belong to the People; they did not discover it in all *Christ's Testament*: It had no footing either in *Divine Tradition*, or *Apostolical Observation* or *Practice*, so far as they had Eyes to penetrate into them. And I shall readily confess my self as short sighted as they were, for I have never yet been able to trace such a *Legacy* in any Corner of the whole New Testament, as we have it. I know not if G. R. will pretend that it was a *Verbal Legacy*, and can be proved by *unwritten Tradition*. But to pass this: 'Tis enough, if in St. *Cyprian's* time, the People had no such *Power*: For if they had no *Elective Voices* in the *Promotion* of their *Bishops*, it will not be every, it will not be any crazy Proof, that will make it *Credible* that they had the *Power* of *Definitive Voices* in *Provincial Councils*. And all this will farther appear, when we consider.

§ XLIV.

2. THAT in St. *Cyprian's* Days, the Governours of the Church had as good a Sense, as we have now, of the *Multitudes* being very unfit and unqualified, very insufficient and incompetent for being entrusted with *Powers* of so great Consequence, as either that of choosing their *Bishops*, or this of defining in *Provincial Councils*. St. *Cyprian* sticks not to be-
stow

flow the Epithet of *Unskilful* upon the *Multitude* (y). And he gives a very sensible Account of their *Weakness*, to *Antoninus*, when he tells him how easily many of them were *disposed*, not by the badness of their Inclinations, but their *Ignorance* to turn *Libellaticks* (as they call'd them) in the Days of the *Decian* Persecution (z). And doth he not suppose them *weak* and easily *imposed* on, when he makes it an Aggravation of the Villany of his Five *Rebellious* Presbyters, that they had taken such Advantages of the Weakness of the People, as to have so and so seduced and withdrawn them from their Duty to their Bishop (a)? Nay, even the *Martyrs* and *Confessors* themselves (those of the People who had the greatest Credit and Authority) on divers Occasions are not spared by him; but very freely charged with want of *Thinking* and *Skill* in the *Discipline* of the *Church*. They are represented by him sometimes, I say, as having more *Zeal* than *Knowledge*, and as very much needing to be instructed and corrected (b). Now, how is it imaginable, that those who were so sensible, and had so much Experience and Conviction of the *Weakness*, the *Ignorance*, the *Unskilfulness*, (I may justly add, if not the *Giddiness*, yet the *Headiness* and *Rashness*) of the *People*, would yet have allowed them the *Privilege* of a *Definitive Voice* in any *Ecclesiastical Judicatory*? But the full Force of this Consideration will be best discerned in the Sequel. But neither is this all. For,

(y) Vide mox in (h).
(z) Nunc tamen etiam iste qui libello maculatus est, postea quam nobis admonentibus didicit nec hoc se facere debuisse, & si manus pura sit & Os ejus feralis cibi contagia nulla polluerint, conscientiam tamen ejus esse pollutam flet auditis nobis & lamentatur & quod deliquit nunc admonetur, & non tam CRIMINE quam ERRORE de-

ceptus, quod jam de cætero instructus sit confessatur. Ep. 55. p. 107.

(a) Vide de Lapsis, p. 137. & Ep. 16. p. 36. Ep. 17. p. 39. Ep. 43. p. 82.

(b) Martyres per Calorem Gloriæ Scripturam minus Contemplantēs, à Presbyteris & Diaconis Suggestentibus admoneri deberent. Ep. 16. p. 38.

Et Credideram quidem Presbyteros & Diaconos-monere vos (Martyres & Confessores) & instruere plenissime. Ep. 15. p. 33.

Frater noster *Lucianus* & ipse unus de Confessoribus, fide quidem calidus & virtute robustus, sed minus Dominica lectione fundatus. IMPERITI jampridem se VULGI auctorem constituens. Univerforum Confessorum nomine Epistolam scripsit qua pene omne vinculum fidei, & Timor Dei & Mandatum Domini & Evangelii Sanctitas solveretur. *Lucianus* circa intelligentiam lectionis Dominicæ---minus peritus. Ep. 26. Multa hujusmodi Testimonia concervasse facillimum fuisset.

3. WHATEVER Interest the People had in Provincial & XLV. Synods, it did equally belong to All. No Footstep of any interest, or Right, or Privilege appropriated to some beyond the rest: Nothing like a Delegation of any Number of Persons

by the *People*, no *Representation* of the *People* by any of their own *Quality*: No *Commissioners* from the *People* to appear in their *Stead*, in Provincial or any other Councils. No Intimations, no Vestiges, I say, of any such *Democrastical Schemes*, or *Forms*, observable in the Monuments of that *Age*. Whatever *Right*, *Power*, *Interest*, or *Privilege*, belong'd to the *People*, belong'd indefinitely, i. e. to all the [*Stantes Laici*] or as sometimes it is worded to the [*Plebs Universa*] the [*Omnis Fraternitas*] and the [*Omnis Fratrum Numerus*] that is, the whole Multitude of the Faithful, without Exception, Restriction or Limitation; without Obligation or Confinement to any thing like Delegation, Representation, or Personation. Nothing more manifest than this in the Records of that *Age*. All the Epistles wherein the *People* were concern'd, are directed PLEBI UNIVERSÆ to all and every one of the *People*, or in Terms equivalent. Not a Syllable in so much as *One*, in the least, insinuating, that there were any *Laic Representatives* of the *People* to whom such Epistles were either principally or particularly directed: as is evident from the Margent (c), wherein all such Epistles are accounted for. Would you have it yet more particularly and plainly unfolded? Consider then what follows.

(c) *The Inscription of Ep. 17. runs thus. Cy-*

prianus Fra-

tribus in Plebe consistentibus. Indefinitely to all those who had not lapsed. p. 39.

Of Ep. 38. (p. 74.) Cyp. Presbyteris & Diaconibus, item PLEBI UNIVERSÆ, S.

Of Ep. 39. (p. 76.) Cyp. P P. & D D. & PLEBI UNIVERSÆ.

Of Ep. 40. (p. 78.) Cyp. P P. & D D. & PLEBI UNIVERSÆ carissimis & desideratissimis Fratribus. S.

Of Ep. 43. (p. 81.) Cyp. PLEBI UNIVERSÆ. S. Of Ep. 58. (p. 120.) Cyprianus PLEBI Thibari CONSISTENTI, to all the Faithful there. Of Ep. 65. Cyp. Episteto Fratri & PLEBI ASSURAS CONSISTENTI, still indefinitely. Of Ep. 67. (p. 170.) Cyprianus, Cæcilius, &c. Felici Presbytero & PLEBIBUS CONSISTENTIBUS ad Legionem & Asturicæ; item Lælio Diacono & PLEBI Emeritæ consistenti; fratribus in Domino. S. To all the Faithful in those Districts. Of Ep. 81. (p. 238.) Cyp. P P. & D D. & PLEBI UNIVERSÆ.

§ XLVI.

St. CYPRIAN tells his Presbyters and Deacons, *Ep. 14.* as we have heard before, that *He had resolved to do nothing without the consent of his People*, indefinitely. And *Ep. 38.* Having directed his Letter, PLEBI UNIVERSÆ, to the whole *Laiety*, as well as to his Presbyters and Deacons, he tells them, that in the Ordinations of Clergy-men, it was his

(d) In *Or-* Custom to consult them, &c. (d) And *Ep. 45.* He tells *Cor-*
dinandis
Clericis solemus vos ante consulere, & Mores & Merita Singulorum communi consilio
pnoderare. *Ep. 38. p. 74.*

nelius, he had communicated his Mind and Purpose, about adhering to him (*Cornelius*) as *Rightful Bishop of Rome*, and *repudiating the Communion of Novatianus, to the Brethren, and to ALL the LAITY* (e). And Ep. 61. he tells *Lucius Bishop of Rome*, that *He (Cyprian) and his Collegues, and the WHOLE FRATERNITY* (i. e. all the Faithful) *sent that Congratulatory Epistle to him* (f). And Ep. 81. written very shortly before his Death, to his Presbyters and Deacons, and ALL the PEOPLE, he tells them; that *with Gods Assistance, before the Sentence of Death be pass'd against him, they shall in common Order what is to be done, &c.* (g) Thus it was at Carthage, and just so it was at Rome. *Cornelius*, Ep. 49. accounting to St. Cyprian about the Reconciliation of *Maximus, Urbanus, &c.* tells him, that the *whole Transaction was communicated to the People*, and that *thereupon there was a Mighty Concourse of the Fraternity* (h). And St. Cyprian in his next Epistle to *Cornelius*, Congratulates the *Unanimity of the People*, and their Joy at such a Reconciliation, using the comprehensive Phrase of the WHOLE FRATERNITY; and he farther tells him, that it likewise was the Cause of great rejoycing to the WHOLE NUMBER of the BRETHREN at Carthage (i). And Ep. 59. he tells the same *Cornelius*, that he doubts not but he (*Cornelius*) communicates his (*Cyprian's*) Letters not only to the *most Flourishing Clergy presiding with him*, but also to the *most Holy and most Numerous Laity* (k). From these Instances it is plain, that it was the *Whole Laity* that was concern'd in *particular Churches*, and not any particular delegated or privileged number of them.

nuandus, & MAGNUS FRATERNITATIS CONCURSUS factus est. Ep. 49. p. 93.

(i) Merito illos revertentes summo, ut scribis, Gaudio & Clerus & PLEBS & FRATERNITAS OMNIS EXCEPIT. Nam cum istic (*Carthagini*) letatus sit OMNIS FRATRUM NUMERUS. Ep. 51. p. 95.

(k) Quamquam sciam, florentissimo illic Clero tecum Præsidenti & Sanctissimæ atque AMPLISSIMÆ PLEBI legere te semper Literas nostras. Ep. 59. p. 139.

AND so it was also with regard to *Provinces*. Thus, when § XLVII. the *Roman Clergy*, Ep. 30. and the *Roman Confessors*, Ep. 31. approve of St. Cyprian's Resolution and Advice about delaying to determine any thing concerning the *Lapsed*, till the Persecution should relent, and Synods might be convoked,

(e) Quanquā mens nostra & propositum jam tunc fratribus & PLEBII istic UNIVERSÆ Manifestatum fuisset. Ep. 45. p. 87.

(f) Vicarius verò pro nobis, Ego & Collegæ & FRATERNITAS OMNIS has ad vos literas Mittimus. Ep. 61. p. 145.

(g) Quid autem decetero nos observare conveniat in Commune disponemus. Ep. 81. p. 240.
(h) Quod erat consequens, omnis hic Actus POPULO erat insi-

(l) Collatione
Conflictorum
factacum Epil-
copis Presby-
teris, Diaconis,
Confessoribus
pariter ac
STANTI-
BUS LAICIS

Ep. 30. p. 59.

Vide paria

Ep. 31. p. 63. &

Ep. 55. p. 102.

(m) Acturi &

apud nos, &

apud ipsos

Confessores &

apud PLEBEM

UNIVERSAM

causam suam cum in Sinum Matris Ecclesiae colligi

caeperimus. Ep. 16. p. 38.

(n) Ep. 19. p. 42. Vide Supra.

(o) Non tantum cum Collegis meis, sed & cum PLEBE UNIVERSA.

Ep. 34. p. 68.

vocated; they comprehend *all the Faithful*, indefinitely, as having access to those *Synods* (l). And our Martyr, Ep. 16. assures his Presbyters, that if any of them should continue to reconcile the Lapsers, without his allowance, *they should be made to answer for it before the WHOLE PEOPLE*, so soon as a Synod might meet (m). And again, Ep. 19. He tells his Clergy, that the *Case* of the *Lapsers* shall be considered and determined, when it shall be seasonable for Bishops with their Clergy, to meet [*Præsentæ & Stantium Plebe*] the Multitude of the Faithful being also present (n). And Ep. 34. He again tells them, that the *Case* of *Philumenus*, &c. shall be examined in the next Provincial Synod, when he shall have Opportunity to meet, not only with his Collegues the Bishops, but with the WHOLE PEOPLE (o).

§ XLVIII.

BY this time, I think, it's evident, that whatever Interest or Privilege, Power, Right, or Prerogative, the *Laity* had in the Government of the Church, whether in the Judicatories of particular Dioceses, or in Provincial Councils, the same belong'd *equally* to *all* who could come under that Denomination. Now, this I take to be a perfect Demonstration that none of that Denomination, none of the *Plebs* had a *Definitive Voice* in a *Provincial Synod*: For if *one* had it, *all* had it: And that *all* should have had it is so unreasonable, so unaccountable, so impracticable, as not only to make it incredible, but even unintelligible, if not simply impossible. If all had had it, how could any *Order* have been observed? How could infinite *Confusions* have been avoided? How could all have been brought to a tolerable Knowledge of the *Merits* of *any one* of a Thousand *Causes*? or of the *Weight* of *any one* of a Thousand *Questions*? or of the *true State* of *any one* of a Thousand *Controversies*? How could the *Governours* of the Church have signified any thing? How could they have serv'd the Ends of Government? Nay where had there been a *Fund* for the Distinction between *Governours* and *Subjects*? But there is no end of such Absurdities. I shall instance there-
fore

fore only in one thing more, to shew the Incredibility of such a Constitution. If *all and every one* of the *People* had *Definitive Voices* in *Provincial Councils*, we may suppose them *all* to meet when any such Council was convoked: But where could such a number meet? It is certain from all the Histories, and all the Circumstances of the Church, in those times, that they did not, could not meet, in the open Fields. That would have given too colourable Grounds of Suspicion and Jealousie, to the then Heathen Civil Governours; an Offence very ill suiting with the Principles as well as the Prudence of Christians then; who as they abhorred all Rebellion, all *Defensive Arms* for Religion, so they were proportionably careful to avoid all Appearances of it. But if all the *Faithful* of 87 *Dioceses*, for example, had met in any open plain about *Carthage*, who sees not that they would have made the Figure of a formidable Army? Besides, 'tis certain, and we have our Martyr's word for it (p), that by the Custom of those times, *Councils* were kept where there was an *Altar placed*, and *Seats* for, at least, all the *Bishops* who were present: So that nothing can be surer, than that they were kept within Doors. And 'tis as certain, that in all *Carthage*, in those times (if there were any *Churches* at all, for that is a Question, among learned Men) there was neither *Church* nor *Chappel* large enough to contain such a Confluence of People. Nay what modern Church can contain so many Thouldands, as we are bound both in Reason and Charity to believe were in those 87 *Dioceses*, whose *Bishops* met at *Carthage*, Anno 256. Nothing more certain than that all the *Stantes Laici*, all the *Faithful*, had not *Definitive Voices* in *Synods*; nay that none of them had them; seeing *every one* had as much Interest as *any other*. In this Third with the Two preceeding Considerations laid together, there seems to me to be so much Evidence against the *People's* having had the *Right* of *Definitive Voices* in *Provincial Synods*, that they may be sufficient to satisfy any Rational Man about it, tho' there was no more to be said; and yet there is much more, as I shall shew as briefly as I can.

(p) Cornelium
noster quem-
admodum
Episcopi A-
fricani Nova-
tiani Legatos
retudissent
docens, hæc
habet: Hono-
ris etiam
communis
Memores &
Gravitatis Sa-
cerdotalis ac
Sanctitatis re-
spectum te-
nentes, eque
ex diverso in
Librum ad
nos transmis-
sum congesta
fuerant re-
spuimus; con-
siderantes pa-
riter & pon-
derantes quod
in tanto fra-

trum religiosoque Conventu, CONSIDENTIBUS DEI SACERDOTIBUS. (i.e. Episcopis) & ALTARI POSITO, nec legi debeant nec audiri. Ep. 45. p. 87.

4. THEN

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

4. THEN, It must be obvious to common Sense, that the People had not *Definitive Voices* in *Provincial Councils*, if they had not them in the *Judicatories* of the *particular Churches* to which they belong'd, and whereof they were Members. Now, the *particular Churches* of *Rome*, and *Carthage* are Two, concerning which we have as full and distinct accounts as of any of those Times: and considering how much in those Days, *Catholick Unity* was in Request; and how much this depends on *Uniformity*, in (at least) the *Substantials* of the *Frame* and *Constitution* of *particular Churches*, it is rational to think, that Generally all other particular Churches were of the same Frame and Constitution with those Two most renowned Churches: Or if there was any (if any where there was any) *Discrepancy*, 'tis rational to impute it to some *Defect* in the *Discrepant Churches*, rather than to any *Excess* or *Error* in those Two so conspicuous and exactly constituted Churches. I say, if any where there was any *Substantial Discrepancy*. And I say it merely upon the Supposition of the simple Possibility of it; not at all upon the Supposition of any Probability that, *De Facto* there was any such *Discrepancy*. Now, in the Administration of the Government and Discipline of neither of those Two Churches in the Days of St. Cyprian, had the People *Definitive Voices*.

§ L.

NOT of the Church of *Rome*: Neither when she wanted a Bishop, nor when she had One. She wanted a Bishop more than a Year between the Death of *Fabianus* and the Promotion of *Cornelius*: And during all that vacancy, the Administration of the Government was *Solely* in the Hands of the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*: The People had no *Interest* in it: So those *Presbyters* and *Deacons* declare most evidently, in their Epistles written to St. Cyprian, in the Days of that *Inter-Pontificum*, that Inter-reign, if we may so call it. They tell the Clergy of *Carthage*, Ep. 8. that *they were the Men who ruled the Flock instead of the Pastor*, the Bishop (q). So that the Flock had no hand in *Ruling* itself. And they tell them, that *They were those who separated the Lapsed from the Communion of the Church* (r). And Ep. 30. they tell our Martyr that

(q) Et cum
incumbat NO-
BIS qui VI-
DE MUR
PRÆPOSI-
TI esse, &

VICE PASTORIS Custodire gregem. Ep. 8. (Pam. 3.) p. 16.

(r) Quos (Lapsos) Separatos à NOBIS non derelinquimus, sed ipsos cohortati sumus. Ibid. p. 17.

They

They were the Persons who at that time exerted the Governing Power of the Church, in abstaining these who had Sacrificed to the Hea-then Deities; And that they did it, as then, having the Power of Granting or Refusing Communion, and the only Physicians who could prescribe Medicines to the diseased Lapsers (s). In-
deed they do expressly distinguish themselves, as being the Administrators, from the Confessors themselves (those who, of all the People could have made the likeliest Pretences to a Joyn't- Power in the Administration) as being only Ap-
provers of the Measures they had taken t). They do in-
deed in express Terms confess, that there were Acts of Go-
vernment which they could not perform; which could not be perform'd but by a Bishop, and so must be left unperform'd till One should be Installed: But then in that same Period, they signify, that They had done all that a Clergy without a Bishop could do (tt). They say that they had resolv'd so and so concerning the Lapsers, not with the Advice of the People, but of divers Bishops who had Occasion to be in the City, thereby fairly excluding the People (u). And all this they had done, Conforming their Administration of the Go-
vernment and Discipline, with the greatest Care they could, to the Rules of Prudence; avoiding both Extremes, of too great Slackness, and too great Severity (v). And the same Inter-
pontifical Power of theirs, is likewise fairly supposed in Ep. 36. written likewise to our Martyr, as we shall see by and by. But this is not all.

(s) Nec non etiam contra illos quoque qui illicitis Sacrificiis manus suas atque Ora polluerant--- fidem N O- S T R A M (P P. & D D.) Consensumq; Monstravi- mus. Abst enim--ut pro- perata nimis remedia COM- MUNICA- TIONUM utique non profutura praesentur--- Ubi enim po- terit Indul- gentiae Medi- cina procede- re, si etiam IPSE MEDI-

CUS intercepta poenitentia indulget periculis. Ep. 30. (Pam. 31.) p. 57. 58.

(t) Quanquam Confessorum quoque---Literas habeas Conspirantes cum literis NOSTRIS, quibus Severitatem Evangelicae Disciplinae protulerunt, & illicitas (sive Lapsorum, sive aliorum quorundam Martyrum & Confessorum) PETITIONES ab Ecclesiae pudore revocarunt. Ibid. p. 58.

(tt) Quanquam NOBIS (P P. & D D.) differenda hujus rei Necessitas major in-
cumbat, quibus post excessum Nobilissimae Memoriae viri Fabiani, nondum est EPIS-
COPUS propter rerum & temporum difficultates CONSTITUTUS qui omnia ista mo-
deretur, & eorum qui Lapsi sunt possit cum AUCTORITATE & CONSILIO habere
rationem. Ibid. p. 58. 59.

(u) Cujus temperamenti moderamen NOS hic tenere quarentes cum Episcopis vicinis
Nobis & appropinquantibus---& longe positis---ante Constitutionem EPISCOPI
nihil innovandum putavimus, sed Lapsorum curam mediocriter temperandam esse
credidimus, ut interim dum EPISCOPUS dari à Deo NOBIS iustinetur,
in suspenso eorum qui moras possunt dilationis sustinere, causa teneatur. Ibid. p. 60.

(v) NOBIS tamen anxie curantibus, ut nec pronam NOSTRAM improbi homi-
nes laudarent facilitatem, nec vere poenitentes accuserent NOSTRAM, quasi duram
Cruditatem. Ibid. p. 61.

§ LI.

OUR Martyr also, always, during that Vacancy at Rome, writes to those *Roman Presbyters* and *Deacons*, as having in their Hands the Administration of the Affairs of that Church; without so much as once supposing or insinuating, that the People had any Hand in it, Share or of it. Particularly Ep. 9. He writes to them as having the Right to write *Authorita-*

(w) Legi
literas vestras
—& quo-
niam me in
iisdem literis
& scriptura
& sensus &
Chartæ ipse
quoque mo-
verunt—
eandem ad
VOS Episto-
lam authenti-
cam remisit, an
ipsa sit quam
Clementio
Hypodiacono
perferendam
dedistis, per-
quam enim
grave est si
EPISTOLÆ
CLERICÆ
(ecce non omi-
sam solum ve-
rum etiam Ex-
clusam plebem)
veritas men-
dacio aliquo
& fraude corrupta est. Ep. 9. (Pam. 4.) p. 19.

tive Letters during that *Interval* (w). And Ep. 20. He writes to them as those to whom he was obliged to give an Account of his own *Administration*, and *Discipline*, and *Diligence*, &c. (x) Not indeed as to the Governours of a *Superiour Church*, to which he stood in any Degree of *Subjection*; but according to the then common *Rules* and *Measures* observed between *Sister Churches*, for the mutual *Confirmation* and *Ratification* of their Respective *Acts* of *Government* and *Discipline*. And he writes so to them that there might be no *Discrepancy*, but an exact and perfect *Uniformity*, in the Exercise of Government between *him* and *them* (y), which evidently shews that, which I aim at, namely, that he look'd on them, in those Circumstances of the Church of *Rome*, as the *only Persons* who were in the *Actual Administration* of her Government. He proceeds likewise upon the same Supposition in Ep. 27. Not only insisting on the common Obligation lying on *Sister Churches* to account to *One* another for their *Discipline*, for the *Preservation* of *Catholic Unity* (z), but particularly, thankfully resenting the good Office, they, as the then Governours of the *Roman Church* had done him, by declaring so positively and distinctly, that *it was their Sentiment that the Lapsers should be obliged fully to perform their Courses of Penance before their Reconciliation* (a).

& fraude corrupta est. Ep. 9. (Pam. 4.) p. 19.

(x) Necessarium duxi ad VOS (P. P. & D. D. Romanos) has literas facere quibus V O B I S Actus nostri & Disciplinæ & Diligentiae Ratio redderetur. Ep. 20. (Pam. 15.) p. 42.

(y) Standum putavi & cum vestra Sententia, ne Actus noster qui Adunatus esse & Consentire circa omnia debet, in aliquo discreparet. Ibid. p. 43.

(z) Post factas ad VOS literas, F. F. C. C. quibus Actus noster expositus—aliud accessit quod nec ipsum latere vos debuit, &c. Ep. 27. (Pam. 23.) p. 53.

(a) Opportune vero supervenerunt literæ vestræ—Laborantes enim hic Nos & contra invidiæ impetum totis fidei viribus resistentes multum sermo vester adjuvit, ut divinitus Compendium fieret—quod secundum Evangelii legem stet nobiscum fortiter atque Unanimiter etiam Sententia vestra. Ibid. p. 53.

Which

Which had very much assisted him and strengthened his Hands in keeping up the *Vigour of his own Discipline*. And his next Epistle to them is of the same Strain, and imports the same thing, namely, that they, and *they alone*, and not in *Conjunction* with the *People*, had, in their Hands, the *Administration* of the *Government* and *Discipline* of the *Roman Church*, so long as she wanted a *Bishop* (b). And they, in their answer to him; (*Ep. 36.*) commend his Care in giving them an account of *Privatus Lambesitanus*, (which, it seems, he had given them in another Epistle not now extant) and they do it for this reason, that it becomes all *Governours of Churches* (of which number they reckon themselves to be, especially in their present Circumstances) to watch for the *Welfare of the Church Catholick* (c).

(b) Vide totam Epistolam, nobis, 35. Pamel. 29. p. 69.

(c) Quod autem pertinet ad privatum

Lambesitanum, pro tuo more fecisti, qui rem nobis sollicitam nunciare voluisti, OMNES enim NOS (*Ecclesiarum Rectores*) decet pro corpore totius Ecclesiæ, cujus per varias quasque Provincias membra digesta sunt EXCUBARE. *Ep. 36. (Pamel. 30.) p. 71.*

TO the preceeding Accounts, not for compleating but § LII. for encreasing the Demonstration, let me add the Testimony of *Celerinus*, a Noble *Roman Confessor*, who lived in those Days. Two of his Female Friends, *Numeria* and *Candida* had *Lapsed*: And he was earnest to have them restored to the Communion of the Church. He writes therefore to his Brother Confessor *Lucianus*, living at *Carthage*, desiring him to intercede, to Petition for them (as then was the Custom of Martyrs and Confessors, as by and by we shall more fully learn) why? because the *PRÆPOSITI*, the *Governours of the Church of Rome*, The *Presbyters* and *Deacons* to whose Inspection they belong'd, had ordered them to continue in the *State of Penitents*, till a *BISHOP* should be constituted (d). A Testimony equally and irresistably Demonstrating, both that a Bishop had more Power than *Presbyters*, being able to do what they could not; and that, during that *Interpontificate* at *Rome*, which, this while, we had in View, the Administration of the Government and Discipline (so far as in an *Interpontificate* they could be administered) was intirely in the Hands of the *Præpositi*, the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and no Share of it in the Hands of the *Plæbs*, the *Laity*.

(d) Quarum jam causâ audita præceperunt eas PRÆPOSITI sic esse donec EPISCOPUS CONSTITUATUR. *Ep. Inter Cyprianicus. 21. p. 46.*

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

FAR less is it to be imagined, that the People had *Definitive Voices* in the Exercise of the Government of that Church, after the *Inthronization* of *Cornelius*. It had been certainly a pretty odd Constitution of a Church, if, during the *Vacancy* of the *Episcopal Chair*, the *Power* had been wholly in the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, but so as to devolve on the *People*, when the *Chair* was filled. But there is no need of such reasoning (however clear and forcible) where the *Matter of Fact* is so convincing. For nothing can be clearer, than that the *People* had not so much as a *Shadow* of a *Share* of the *Governing Power*, in a very remarkable Instance, recorded by *Cornelius* himself, in that which is the 49th among *St. Cyprian's* Epistles. The Story, in short, is this: *Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius, Macarius*, and a great many more of those who had separated with *Novatianus*, when *Cornelius* was promoted to the Bishoprick, turning sensible of their Error, signified their Willingness to return to the *Communion* of *Cornelius*, which was indeed the *only true Catholick Communion*. So soon as *Cornelius* gets sufficient Proof and Assurance of their Sincerity in it, he is as willing to receive them as they are to return. But a *Matter* of such Consequence must be transacted with both a *due Deliberation* and a *Suitable Solemnity*. First, therefore, he convokes the *Presbytery*: And that the *Reception* of the Returners might be the firmer, being performed with *common Advice and Consent*, *Five other Bishops* were also present. In this Meeting of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, the Case is maturely considered, and the *Opinions* of all present are not only asked, but taken in Writing (a Copy whereof was sent to *St. Cyprian* with this 49th Epistle) it was unanimously consented to by all, it seems, that the Returners should be received. This done, they are called in; and they humbly beseech that their Error may be forgotten as well as forgiven; and they promise to live dutifully for the future. And then, after the *Reconciliation* is thus really and effectually made by *Cornelius*, with the *Advice* of his *Colleagues* and *Presbyters*, the *People* are allowed to be present: But to what end? That their *Opinions* may be asked, and their *Votes* taken? Nothing like it. What then? To be *Witnesses* (and that indeed was all) of the *Reception* of the Returners. The very words are, *That they might SEE them fixed in the Church, whom, for a*
long

long time they had with great Cries, seen wandering and going astray. And so, after the Returners had publickly and solemnly, in the Audience of the People, renewed their Acknowledgments of their Error, and their Professions, &c. We commanded Maximus the Presbyter to take his Place (says Cornelius) and the rest we received with the great Good liking of all the People (d). So evident it is from the Series of the Epistle, that all the People's Part was, to be Witnesses, give their Approbation, and express their Joy and Satisfaction. And it is farther confirmed by what has already been observed in St. Cyprian's Return to this Epistle of Cornelius's (e). And from Ep. 53. Written to our Martyr by those very Persons who were reconciled, Maximus, Urbanus, &c. wherein they tell him, they had made their Peace with Cornelius their Bishop, and likewise with all the Clergy, to the JOY of the whole Church, &c. (f) Most clearly and distinctly excluding the People from all Share of Power or Authority in the Reconciliation. Such was the People's Interest in the Government of the Church of Rome.

(d) Omni igitur actu ad me (Cornelium Episcopum) perlatoplacuit contrahi Presbyterium. Adfuerunt etiam Episcopi quinque qui & hodie presentes erant, ut firmato Consilio quid circa personam eorum

(ad Ecclesiam Redeuntium) Observari deberet Consensu omnium statueretur. Et ut motum omnium & Consilium singulorum dignoscere, etiam Sententias nostras (qui in Confessu fuimus) placuit in Notitiam vestram proferri, quas & subjectas leges. His ita Gestis, in Presbyterium venerunt Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius, & Macarius, & plerique fratres qui se eis adjunxerant, summis precibus desiderantes ut ea quæ ante gesta fuerant in Oblivionem traderentur—Quod erat consequens, Omnis hic Actus populo fuerat insinuandus ut & ipsos VIDERENT in Ecclesia constitutos quos errantes & palabundos jamdiu viderant & dolebant. Quorum (nempe Redeuntium) voluntate cognita MAGNUS (ergo non totius) fraternitatis concursus factus est. Una vox erat omnium gratias Deo agentium, gaudium pectoris lacrymis experientes, Complectentes eos quasi hodie de pena Carceris fuissent liberati—quapropter Maximum Presbyterum locum suum agnoscere iussimus: Ceteros cum ingenti Populi Suffragio recepimus. Ep. 49. (Pamel. 46.) p. 92. 93.

(e) Vide Supra.

(f) Nos habito Consilio—cum Cornelio EPISCOPO NOSTRO pariter & cum Univerſo Clero PACEM FECISSE, cum GAUDIO etiam Univerſa Ecclesiæ, prona etiam omnium Caritate. Ep. 53. (Pam. 50.) p. 98.

NOR was it greater in the Church of Carthage, considering what has been discoursed concerning the Church of Rome, and particularly, that St. Cyprian was so far from questioning any thing in the Constitution of the Government of that Church, that he always justified and approved it; it is not imaginable that the People's Interest was Greater or Different in his own. Indeed, that it was no Greater might be infinitely proved:

A Vindication of a Discourse Entituled,

proved: It might be proved from almost every particular Epistle he wrote, in the Days of his Retirement, whether to his Presbyters and Deacons by themselves, or to his People, or to Clergy and People together, or particularly to the Martyrs and Confessors. For, as in most of them he expressly distinguishes his *Clergy* from his *People*, so he either directly affirms, or plainly insinuates, or manifestly supposes, that, during that time of his absence, the Reins of Government and Discipline (in Subordination to himself) were in the Hands of his Presbyters and Deacons; and that it was their part, as being *Præpositi*, Rulers, and *Pastores*, Shepherds, to *Feed* the *Flock*, to *Govern* the *People*, to *Provide* for the *People*, to *Consult* the *Good* of the *People*, to *Instruct* and *Direct* the *People*; to keep them *Calm* and *Peaceable*, to *Rebuke* the *Rash*, to *Correct* the *Extravagant*, to *Restrain* the *Exorbitant*, &c. In a word, to perform all such *Acts of Government and Discipline*, as were proper for Persons in their Stations to perform in his Absence: And all without so much as once saying, or supposing, or insinuating, that it was to be done in *Conjunction* with the *People*. On the contrary, whoso carefully reads those Epistles, cannot but clearly perceive, that the *Martyrs* and *Confessors* themselves (who had peculiar Prerogatives) ought to have been *Ruled* and *Governed* by the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. Nay, he expressly tells, how much it grieved him that some of the *Confessors* would not be *Govern'd* by the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and wishes he himself were in a Condition to be on the Place, to reduce them to order and compress their Insolence;

(g) Dominus faciat ut ego iteratione (as of his own *Sovereign Authority*, so) that the *Reins of Discipline*, were in the *Hands* of the *Clergy*, and no Share thereof in the *Hands* of the *People*. And how seriously does he complain to the *Martyrs* (h). And to the *Peo-*

componere mentes eorum ad servandam Gloriam suam possim. Doleo enim quando audio quosdam improbe, & insolenter discurrere & ad ineptias, vel ad Discordias vacare, Christi membra, & jam Christum professâ, per Concubitus illicitos inquinare, nec à PRESBYTERIS aut DIACONIS REGI posse. Ep. 14. p. 32.

(h) Et credideram quidem Presbyteros & Diaconos qui illic præsentés sunt monere vos (*Martyres & Confessores*) & instruere sed nunc cum Maximo animi dolore cognosco, non tantum illic vobis non suggeri divina præcepta, sed adhuc potius impediri, ut ea quæ à vobis ipsis & circa Deum caute, & circa Sacerdotem Dei (*Episcopum*) honorifice fiunt, à quibusdam Presbyteris resolvantur. Ep. 15. p. 35.

ple (i). Nay even to themselves (k), *That his Presbyters and Deacons, did not govern them and keep them in Order, as their Stations obliged them to have done; but endeavoured to seduce and wheedle them into Extravagancies and Enormities?* And what plainer Evidence can there be for any thing than this is, that the *People* had no *Potestative Interest*, no *Definitive Voice* in the *Government*? But to reckon up and insist on all Arguments colligible to this purpose, would make a Tedious if not an Endless Work: And therefore at present I shall content my self with the Hints I have given of the *No Authoritative Interest*, the *No Defining Power* of the *People* in the Administration of the *Government* and *Discipline* of the Church of *Carthage*, during the Days of our *Martyr's Retirement*.

(i) Audio tamen quosdam de Presbyteris nec Evangelii Memores, nec quid ad nos Martyres scripserint cogitantes, nec Episcopo honorem Sacerdotii sui & Cathedræ reservantes, jam cum Lapsis communicare capisse---Vos quidem nostri

Presbyteri & Diaconi monere debuerant, ut Commendatas sibi Oves foverent—Ego plebis nostræ & quietem novi pariter & timorem qui in Satisfactione Dei & deprecatione vigilarent, nisi illos quidam de Presbyteris Gratificantes deceptissent. Ep. 17. (Pamel. 12.) p. 39.

(k) Contumeliam Episcopatus nostri dissimulare & ferre possum, sicut dissimulavi semper & pertuli: sed dissimulandi nunc locus non est, quando decipiatur Fraternitas nostra, à quibusdam vestrum (P. P.) qui dum sine ratione restituendæ Salutis plausibiles esse cupiunt, magis Lapsis absunt.—Sed nunc illi (Lapsi) rei non sunt—erunt autem rei, qui PRÆSUNT & hæc fratribus non suggerunt, ut instructi à PRÆPOSITIS faciant omnia cum Dei timore—Martyres per Calorem Gloriæ Scripturam minus Contemplantes—à Presbyteris & Diaconis admoneri deberent. Ep. 16.

Et Lapsis quidem potest in hoc venia concedi—sed PRÆPOSITORUM (i. e. Presbyterorum & Diaconorum) est præceptum tenere, & vel properantes vel ignorantes instruere, ne qui Ovium PASTORES esse debent, Lanii fiant. Ep. 15. p. 34.

HAD they any *more* when he was *present*? How can it § LV. be imagined? In short; How many *Acts of Government* did he perform without them? How familiar was it to him industriously to conceal Matters of Consequence from them? Nay, how many things did he, even against their Inclinations? It is not needful to insist on proving the first of these Three Steps (though it were very easie to prove it copiously) for it cannot be doubted, if the other Two can be made to appear, which they can, to a Demonstration. He sometimes industriously *conceal'd* Matters of great Consequence from the People when the *Emissaries of Novatianus* came to him, to importune

(l) A Communicatione
eos nostra
statim cohi-
bendos esse
censuimus Ep.

44. p. 85.

(m) Qui cum
in statione
invidiosis

quoque con-
vitiis & cla-
moribus tur-
bulentis pro-
ruerent & fla-
gitarent, ut
Crimina quæ
se afferre &
probare dice-
bant publicè
à nobis & à
Plebe cognos-
cerentur; gra-
vitati nostræ
negavimus

convenire, ut
Collegæ nostri

jam delecti & ordinati & laudabili multorum sententia comprobati, ventilandum
ultra honorem maledica æmulantium voce pateremur. *Ibid.* p. 85. 86.

(n) Honoris etiam communis Memores & Gravitatis Sacerdotalis ac Sanctitatis respec-
tum tenentes, ex quæ ex diverso in librum ad nos transmissum congesta fuerunt acerbatio-
nibus Criminosis, respuimus considerantes pariter & ponderantes quod in tanto FRA-
TRUM religiosoque Conventu — nec legi debeant nec audiri. Neque enim facile
promenda sunt, & incaute ac temere publicanda quæ discordioso Stylo scripta au-
dientibus Scandalum moveant. *Ep.* 45. p. 87.

(o) Certe quod PRÆPOSITIS & SACERDOTIBUS (i. e. *Episcopis*) congruit, danda
opera est ut talia, cum à quibusdam scribuntur per nos respuantur deinde *varis scrip-
Testimoniis. n. Psal.* 33. 13. & 49. 20. & *Eph.* 4. 29. hoc stabilito, sic pergit, porro —
quando talia quorundam Calumniola temeritate conscripta sunt, legi apud nos non
patimur. *Ep.* 45. p. 87.

(p) Nos enim singulis navigantibus, ne cum Scandalo ullo navigarent, rationem
reddentes, scimus nos hortatos esse eos, ut Ecclesiæ Catholice radicem & Matricem
agnoscerent & tenerent. *Ep.* 48. p. 91.

(q) Cum ad me talia de te (*Cornelio*) & Compresbyteris tecum confidentibus scripta
venissent, quæ religiosam Simplicitatem sonabant, nec ullis Maledictorum & Convi-
torum latratibus perstrepebant, CLERO & PLEBI LEGI PRÆCEPI. *Ep.* 45. p. 87.
Vide Similia Ep. 51. & *Ep.* 61. Utrouque fusc & alibi passim.

son, what Equity would have allowed of such a Course, if the People had had any *Share*, any *Interest* in the Government? If the *Ratification* of either *Cornelius's* or *Novatian's* Episcopacy and Communion, had depended, any manner of way, on their *Decisory Voices*? Indeed,

IN that notable 59th Epistle, which is directed to *Cornelius*, § LVI. he most distinctly shews, that *Laicks* were very far from having that *Interest* in the Government and Discipline of the Church, which the Bishops and inferiour Priests had. For having deduced an account of the unaccountable Presumption of his Presbyters in reconciling the Lapsers so precipitantly and disorderly; he adds thus, *Let Laicks consider what is proper for them to do in this matter; we who are Priests are, after another manner, concern'd to assert and maintain the Divine Majesty, that we may not seem to neglect any thing in this weighty part of our Duty; seeing the Lord admonishes and says; And now O ye Priests, this Commandment is for you, if ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to Heart, to give Honour to my Name, saith the Lord, I will even send a Curse upon you, and I will curse your Blessing, Mal. 2. 12.* Thus, I say, He (r) most manifestly imports, that it was not the Concern of *Laicks*, but of *Priests*, to Order and Exercise Ecclesiastical Discipline. Much more might have been adduced to this purpose. But what needs more, when it is certain, as I have fully proved already (s), when I insisted on the Bishops Prerogative of being the ONE JUDGE (so fully that I shall not here add one Word more about it) that St. Cyprian perform'd most weighty Acts of Government and Discipline, not only without the Consent, but also in Opposition to the Inclinations, nay to the most eager Addresses and Reclamations of the People. And so much may serve at present, to shew, that the People had no more at Carthage, than at Rome, any thing like a *Definitive Voice* in any Matters of Government or Discipline Ecclesiastical. But if not in *These*, then, as I have said, to be sure, not in any other Church or Churches of that Age. But that there may remain no place for any Doubt or Scruple in this matter, let me add one Consideration more, which, if I mistake it not, may drive the Nail to the Head, as we say, that is, throughly and forcibly evince, that the People had no *Definitive Voice* in particular Churches, far (less by undeniable Consequence) in Provincial Synods. It is,

I ii

§. THAT VISS XLIV

(r) Viderint Laici hoc quomodo curent; Sacerdotibus labor major incumbit in asserenda & procuranda Dei Majestate, ne quid videamur in hac parte Negligere; cum admoneat Dominus & dicat & nunc præceptum hoc ad vos est O Sacerdotes: Si non audieritis & si non posueritis in Corde vestro ut detis Honorem Nomini meo, &c. Ep. 59. p. 135. (s) Supra Cap. VISS XLIV

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

5. THAT even *Martyrs* and *Confessors* themselves had no such *Power*. No Man has considered the *Monuments* of those *Times*, who is not ready to acknowledge, that *They*, of all the *People*, were most likely to have had it. *These*, for their *Faith* and *Patience*, their *Fervent Zeal*, and *Fragrant Graces*; their *Glorious Courage*, and *Good Example*, that they might *Persevere* themselves, and *Others* might be *Encouraged* to follow their *Pattern*; were held in mighty *Reputation*. They were reputed *Dearer* to *God*, and in a *Closer Communion* with him, and nearer *Approximation* to him than *Christians* of the common *Size*. They were reckoned in a peculiar *Manner*, *Amici Dei*, the *Friends of God*; those who were to be his *Assessors* at the *Day of Judgment* (r). They had *Præcipuum Nomen*, were *Christians* of highest *Note* and greatest *Value* (u): They were *God's Glorious Souldiers*, and *Christ's Chosen Champions*, and were to wear *Singular Crowns*, and have *Singular Privileges* in *Heaven*; and so deserved on *Earth* to have *Singular Prerogatives*, *Prerogatives* not granted to the other *Stantes Laici*, the *Faithful* of the *Common Fashion*. And yet even these *Martyrs* and *Confessors* had not *Definitive Voices*, no not in the *Particular Churches* they belonged to. Their *Petitions* and *Desires*, their *Intercessions* and *Addresses*, when *Moderate* and *Prudent*, *Equitable* and *Reasonable*, agreeable to the *Precepts* of the *Gospel*, and the *Canons* of the *Church*, and the *Sovereignty* of the *Bishop*, were indeed very much *Regarded*: But then this of *Petitioning*, of *Addressing* to the *Bishops*, was all their *Prerogative* amounted to: And *Bishops*, particularly our *Martyr*, made no *Scruple* to *Refuse* them their *Requests*, when they did not think them *proper* to be granted, nothing more clearly (I might almost add, nor more fully) contain'd in the *Records* of that *Age*.

THE *Case* of the *Lapsers* (very numerous in the *Days* of the *Decian Persecution*) gave occasion more than enough to the *Recording* of it: The *Lapsers*, I say, applied to the *Martyrs* and *Confessors*, as those of greatest *Credit* and *Esteem* (of more than *Presbyters* themselves) to be *Mediators* between them and the *Bishops*, and to *Interceed* for a *Relaxation* of the common *Rules* of *Discipline*; and a *Speedier Reconciliation* than was allowed by the *Canons*, and the *Customary Course* of *Penance*. The *Martyrs* and *Confessors* in ma-

(r) AMICI
DEI & cum
illo postmo-
dum JUDI-
CATORI.
Ep. 15. p. 35.
(u) Quotdam
audio infidere
Numerum
vestrum (Con-
fessorum) &
 tandem PRÆ-
CIPUI NO-
MINIS prava
sua Conversa-
tione destrue-
re. Ep. 13. p. 29.

ny Places were prevail'd with to make those Intercessions: And particularly at *Carthage*, being instigated and encouraged thereto by some Presbyters who retain'd Old Grudges against St. Cyprian's Promotion to the Bishoprick, which prompted them to give him all the Trouble and Disturbance they could cunningly contrive: they made them very warmly and with *Excesses of Zeal* if not of *Humour*; and were so unreasonable in them, that St. Cyprian found it fit to repress them by his Episcopal Authority. Thus it came to be so fully, and, for shewing the *No Potestative Interest* of the People in the Government of the Church, in that Age, so happily Recorded. I say for shewing the *No Potestative Interest* of the People, &c. which is thus demonstrated.

THE *Martyrs and Confessors*, at first, sent an Humble and § LIX Dutiful *Petition* in behalf of the *Lapsed* to St. Cyprian the Bishop, then in his Retirement; earnestly indeed, but with all due regard to his *Chair*, and Episcopal Authority, beseeching him to dispense with the Rigour of the Canons, and not to oblige the Penitents fully to perform the long and tedious Course of Satisfaction usual in such Cases. So we learn from *Ep. 15.* written to those Martyrs and Confessors, who had addressed to him (w). But then those of his Presbyters, who were Blinded with the afore-mentioned Grudge, without so much as waiting his Resolution, fall instantly to work, and with an unexampled Presumption, by their own Authority, and without the Bishops License, reconcile the Lapsed; as it immediately follows in that same Epistle, as you may see on the Margent: But withal, you may see that the Bishop, though one of the meekest and humblest Men on Earth, did not take it pleasantly or digest it easily: On the contrary, he takes it very ill: He takes it as an Argument, that those Presbyters neither feared God, nor regarded the Gospel; that they had forgot their own Duty and abus'd the Martyrs and Confessors, when

(w) Credide-
ram Presby-
teros & Dia-
conos monere
vos (*Martyres
& Confessores*)
—sicut in
præteritum
semper—
factum est ut
Diaconi—
Martyrum
DESIDERIA
—Guber-
narent sed
nunc cum maximo animi dolore cognosco non tantum illic vobis non suggeri divi-
na præcepta sed adhuc potius impediri, ut ea quæ à vobis ipsis & circa Deum cautè &
circa SACERDOTEM DEI honorifice fiunt à quibusdam Presbyteris resolvantur qui
nec timorem Dei nec EPISCOPI honorem cogitantes, cum vos ad me literas direxeritis
quibus examinari DESIDERIA vestra & quibusdam Lapsis pacem dari POSTULATIS
cum persecutione finita convenire in unum cum clero & recolligi cæperimus; illi con-
tra Evangelii legem, contra vestram quoque honorificam PETITIONEM ante actam
pœnitentiam, ante exomologesin gravissimi atque extremi delicti factam, ante manum
ab Episcopo & Clero in pœnitentiam impositam, offerre pro illis & Eucharistiam
dare, i. e. Sanctum Domini Corpus profanare audeant. *Ep. 15. p. 33, 34.*

they had so unaccountably condemn'd their Bishop. He tells the Martyrs and Confessors, that his Presbyters ought to have made another use of their PETITIONS and REQUESTS or Desires, (they are the very Words) *They ought to have reserved them to the Bishop, (waited his Return) and to a peaceable time, &c.* And this he bids the Martyrs tell those Presbyters, and teach them their Duty, who should have taught them theirs (v). And not only so, but Ep. 16.

(v) Vel ex vobis itaque discant quod docere debuerant: PETITIONES & DESIDERIA vestra EPISCOPO SERVIENT; & ad pacem VOBIS PETITIONIBUS dandam maturum & pacatum tempus expectent. A Domino pacem Mater prior sumat; tunc secundum VESTRA DESIDERIA de filiorum pace tractetur — Ea quæ à vobis PETUNTUR religiosa Contemplatione moderemini — sed & illud ad diligentiam vestram redigere & emendare debetis, ut nominatim designetis eos quibus pacem dari DESIDERATIS — designetis (inquam) Nominatim libello & sic ad nos (ad me Episcopum) Fidei & Disciplinae congruentes literas dirigatis. Eadem 17 Epist. p. 34, 35.

(x) Erunt autem Reliqui PRÆSUNT & hæc fratribus non suggerunt ut instructi à præpositis faciant omnia cum Dei timore — Exponunt deinde Invidiæ B. Martyres & Gloriosos Dei Servos cum DEI SACERDOTE committunt, ut cum illi memores LOCINOSTRI ad me literas direxerint, & PETIERINT tunc DESIDERIA SUA examinari & Pacem dari quando ipsa ante Mater Nostra Ecclesia pacem — prior sumpserit, & NOS divina protectio Reduces — fecerit: Hi (Presbyteri) sublato honore quem nobis B. Martyres cum confessoribus servant — ante REDITUM NOSTRUM communicent cum Lapsis — quando etiam si Martyres — contra legem Dei plus aliquid CUPERENT, à P.P. & D.D. suggerentibus admoneri deberent. Ep. 16. p. 37, 38.

(y) Fecerunt ad nos de quibusdam B. Martyres literas PETENTES examinari DESIDERIA SUA. &c. Ep. 17. p. 39.

to PETITION, &c. And that it *was* the Duty of Presbyters and Deacons to have taught them so much, and not to have encouraged them to further steps, seeing whatever was more was certainly undutiful (y). Now that which I take notice of at present, is, that it is clear as Light, that even the Martyrs themselves could not Define, could do no more than Petition. Indeed,

WHAT can be clearer, I say, than it is from what hath been said, that the *Prerogative* of the *Martyrs* was only to *Petition*? But we have not done. Some of the *Confessors*, or rather a great many of them, (perhaps more than had been able to have *Out-voted* St. Cyprian and all his Clergy, had they had the Power of *Voting*) were so far from being calmed or composed by the Three mentioned Epistles, that on the contrary, they raised their *Crests* (being prompted to it by the Male-contents of the Presbytery) so high, that they wrote this Letter (which I translate as much to their Sense, as I can) to St. Cyprian. *All the Confessors, to Pope Cyprian, Greeting. Know, that we have given Peace to all those (Lap- sers) for whose Behaviour, since their Fall, an Account shall be given to you: And our will is, that this our Form (or De- cree) you communicate to other Bishops. We wish you to con- tinue in Communion with the Holy Martyrs. Written by Lu- cianus; Two of the Clergy, an Exorcist and a Lector being present (a).* These Words [*de quibus apud te ratio constite- rit quid post commissum egerint*] I have translated as you see, because our Martyr Ep. 27, directed to the Roman Clergy, repeats these very Words, and says, *such a Clause tended to inflame the Grudge against the Bishops, if, when they came to hear and examine the Cause of every particular Lapsar, they should deny Peace (as possibly they might) to many who already boasted they had got Peace from the Martyrs and Confessors (b):* which makes it clear, that neither He nor his Fellow-bishops did as yet know the Circumstances of those to whom the

§ LX.

(a) Universi
Confessores
Cypriano Pa-
pæ, Salutem.
S C I A S nos
Universis de
quibus apud
te ratio con-
stiterit, quid
post commit-
tum egerint,
dedit pacem:
Et hanc

FORMAM per te, & aliis Episcopis innotescere volumus. Optamus te cum Sanctis Martyribus pacem habere, Prasente de Clero, & Exorcista, & Lectore, Lucianus. Scriptit. Ep. 23. p. 49. Pamel. Ep. 17.

(b) Additum est planè [*de quibus ratio constiterit*] quid post commissum egerint. Quæ res majorem nobis (Episcopis) conflat invidiam, ut nos cum singulorum Causas audire & excutere caperimus videamur multis negare, quod se nunc omnes jactant à Martyribus & Confessoribus accepisse. Ep. 27. (Pamel. 23.) p. 52.

Con-

A Vindication of a Discourse Entituled,

Confessors had given their *Peace*; and by Consequence, that the Verb [*Confiterit*] is to be taken (not in the *Praterite*, but) in the *Future Tense*. This *Form* of these *Confessors* was a Thumping one, indeed, and had an *Air* as if it had been written by Men of no small *Power*, of no mean *Interest* in Church Government and Discipline. But was their true Foundation for such a Towering *Patrick*? We may judge of that by what followed upon it.

§ LXI.

HAVING received this supercilious Letter, our Martyr instantly writes to his Presbyters and Deacons, and tells them, he had got it, indeed, but then, in the very first Sentence, he visibly insinuates, "That it had been the Duty of those Confessors to have been more Humble and Deliberate: And he is so far from complying, that he peremptorily commands and charges his Presbyters and Deacons to keep close to the last Epistles he had written to them, which were the 18th and 19th, wherein, (as has been already accounted (c)) he had given them Orders concerning the *Lapsers*; and particularly, that they should absolve none of them, no not those for whom the *Martyrs* had *Exertioned*, unless in Peril of Death, but oblige all to continue in their *Satisfactions*, till he himself might return, and a Synod of Bishops might be convoked to determine the matter (d). Next, he gives an account of the afore-

(c) Vide
Supra Chap.
V. § XIX. &c.

(d) Dominus
dicit, super
quem respi-
ciam nisi su-
per humilem
&c. — Legi
autem & uni-
versorum
Confessorum
litteras. — Quæ
res cum om-
nium nostrum
(Episcoporum)
Consilium &

Sententiam expectet, præjudicare ego & solus mihi rem communem vindicare non audeo: & ideo INSTETUR interim Epistolis quas ad vos proxime feceram. Ep. 26. (Pam. 18.) p. 51.

(c) Frater noster Lucianus & ipse unus de Confessoribus, fide quidem calidus & Virtute Robustus, sed minus Dominica lectione fundatus — Lucianus vero circa intelligentiam Dominicæ lectionis, ut dixi minus peritus & circa invidiam verecundiæ nostræ relinquendam facilitate sua molestinus, &c. Ep. 27. (Pam. 23.) p. 52, 53.

file.

file (f). That such a *Form*, (such a Presumption rather) tended to *vaine the Bond of Faith, the Fear of God, the Authority of our Lord, and the Sanctity and Stability of the Gospel* (g). That (as hath been already observed) it visibly tended to *load the Bishops with Envy, and expose them to Popular Murmurings*. Nay, that it had already produced most deplorable effects: The *Laspers* animated thereby, in divers Cities, had raised *Mobbs*, and *Tumultuated* to such an *Height*, that they had manifestly *Forced some Bishops to give them Peace and grant them Absolution*. But then, he expressly loads those Bishops who had been so prevail'd with, with the Character of *Faint-hearted*, most plainly importing, that if they had had the *Hearts of Bishops*, they would not have so *Ruined Discipline*, upon the account of whatsoever *Concessions* of Confessors or Rabbles of *Laspers* (h). These and divers other things to the same purpose he has in that Epistle.

(f) Mappal-
cus Martyr
cautus &
verecundus,
legis ac disci-
pline memor,
nullas contra
Evangelium
litteras fecerit
— Saturni-
nus quoque
post tormenta
adhuc in car-
cere constitu-
tus, nullas
ejusmodi liti-
ras emisit.
Ibid. p. 52.
(g) Univerfo-
rum Confesso-
rum Nomine
Lucianus Epi-

istolam (*hanc nempe de qua nobis modo res est*) scripsit, qua pene omne vinculum fidei, & timor Dei, & Mandatum Domini, & Evangelii Sanctitas & Firmitas solveretur
Ibid. p. 52.

(h) Denique hujus seditionis origo jam cœpit, nam in Provincia nostra, per aliquot Civitates in PRÆPOSITOS impetus per Multitudinem factus est & pacem quam semel cuncti à Martyribus & Confessoribus datam clamitabant, Confestim sibi repræsentari coegerunt, territis & subactis PRÆPOSITIS suis, qui ad resistendum minus virtute animi & robore fidei prævalebant. Apud nos etiam quidam turbulenti qui vix à nobis in præteritum regebantur, & in nostram præsentiam differebantur, per hanc Epistolam, velut quibusdam facibus accensi, plus exardescere, & pacem sibi datam extorquere cœperunt. *Ibid. p. 52, 53.*

AND with what Force of Reason does he argue the § LXII. Case in his excellent *Discourse* about the *Laspers*, (written the next Year, *i. e. An. 251*) which, when he wrote, without Question he had the same Extravagance of those Confessors in his Eye: *We believe indeed* (says he) *that the Merits of Martyrs, and the Works of the Just are of great Weight with our Judge: But then it must be when the Day of Judgment comes, when, at the end of the World, Christ's People shall stand before his Tribunal. — And therefore God's Priest (the Bishop) is to do nothing but what is Just, but what is Lawful, but what is not against our Lord, no not at the Desire of Martyrs. The Bishop's Compliance shall be frank and ready, if the PETITIONER observes a religious Moderation. When Martyrs desire*

desire any thing to be done, if what they desire is not written in the Law of God, we must first know that they have God's Allowance for what they desire, and then their Desires may be satisfied. — If the Gospel can be evacuated, the Martyrs can do nothing: If it cannot, they can do nothing against the Gospel: seeing it is by the Gospel that they are Martyrs. — He can do nothing against Christ, whose Hope, Faith, Courage and Glory are intirely in Christ. Those who have obeyed the Commandments of God (as the Martyrs have done) cannot (in Reason) advise the Bishops to do any thing against God's Commandments. — 'Tis only the sincere Penitent that can be profited by the PETITIONS of Martyrs, or the PERFORMANCES of Bishops (i). And a great deal more to this Purpose. But to return to the Epistles.

(i) Credimus quidem posse apud Judicem plurimum Martyrum Merita & Opera Justorum; sed cum Judicii dies venerit — De Lapsis p. 129. — Mandari (i. e. Petunt ut ex totius sermonis serie constat) aliquid Martyres fieri? Si Justa si Licita, si non contra Dominum à DEI SACERDOTE (Episcopo) FACIENDA sunt. Obtemperantes (Episcopi) facilis & prona consensio est, si PETENTIS fuerit religiosa Moderatio. Mandant aliquid Martyres fieri? sed si scripta non sint in Domini lege quæ mandant, ante est ut sciamus illos de Deo impetrasse quod POSTULANT, tunc (Episcopo licebit) FACERE quod mandant. — Ibid p. 129, 130. Martyres aut nihil possunt si Evangelium solvi potest; aut si Evangelium non potest solvi, contra Evangelium facere non possunt qui de Evangelio Martyres fiunt. — Nec dicere aliquid aut facere contra Christum potest cujus & Spes & Fides & Virtus & Gloria omnis in Christo est ut ab EPISCOPIS contra Mandatum Dei FIAT Auctores esse non possunt qui ipsi Dei Mandata fecerunt. — Ibid. p. 130, 131. — Penitenti, Operanti, Roganti potest Deus clementer ignoscere, potest in acceptum referri quicquid pro talibus & PETIERINT Martyres & FECERINT Sacerdotes. Ibid. p. 138.

§ LXIII.

FROM the 27th. (the last mentioned) Epistle, we likewise learn, that the *Roman Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and not only so, but also the *Martyrs* and *Confessors* of that Church, had the same Sentiments with St. Cyprian, and were very far from justifying the Precipitances of the *Carthaginian Confessors*. And our Martyr heartily thanks them for it (k). And again, he thanks the *Roman Martyrs* and

(k) Opportune supervenerunt literæ vestræ quas accepi ad Clerum factas, item quas beati Confessores Moyses & Maximus Nicostratus & cæteri, Saturnino & Aurelio & cæteris (Confessoribus Carthaginensibus) miserunt, in quibus Evangelii plenus Vigor & Disciplina robusta legis Dominicæ continentur. Laborantes hic nos & contra invidiæ impetum totis fidei viribus resistentes multum sermo vester adjuvit, — quod secundum Evangelii legem stet nobiscum fortiter atque unanimiter vestra etiam Sententia. Ep. 27. p. 53.

Con-

Confessors Ep. 28. (l) Who over again condemn the Rashness of their Brethren at *Carthage*, and encourage him to continue in keeping up the *Vigour of Discipline*, Ep. 31. (m) And that on several Considerations to be seen at length in that Epistle (n). As for the *Roman Clergy*, they expressly call the Presumptuous *Addresses* of the *Carthaginian Confessors* **Unlawful Petitions**. They say, that their own *Martyrs* and *Confessors* were of another mind: And they reason against such *Petitions* upon the same very Principles we just now heard our Martyr insisting on, in his Discourse concerning the *Lapsers* (o). This they do, Ep. 30. as you may learn from the Margent (p). And over again, and as plainly, and fully, and closely, Ep. 36. as you may likewise learn from their own Words on the Margent (q). And not only so, but also,

vobiscum Domino copulatos, sollicita admonitione misistis; ut Evangelii Sancta præcepta & tradita nobis semel mandata vitalia, forti & stabili observatione teneantur. Ep. 28. (Pamel. 25.) p. 54.

(m) — Tacere non possumus quin omni vocis nostræ Testimonio prosequamur te Congruente Censura — objurgasse illos qui sine respectu Evangelii Sanctum Domini canibus, & Margaritas porcis profana facillitate donassent, &c. Ep. 31. p. 63. Quibus verbis tam Martyres & Confessores quam Presbyteros perstringi non est quod dubitemus.

(n) Vide Ep. 31. p. 63, 64, 65. fusè.

(o) Vide § LXII.

(p) Confessorum quoque — literas habes conspirantes cum literis nostris quibus Severitatem Evangelicæ Disciplinæ protulerunt & ILLICITAS PETITIONES ab Ecclesiæ pudore revocarunt. Nisi hoc fecissent, Disciplinæ Evangelicæ ruina non facile sarciretur, præsertim cum nulli magis tam congruens esset tenorem Evangelici vigoris illibatum dignitatemque servare, quam qui se excruciantos & excarnificandos pro Evangelio furentibus tradidissent, ne Martyrii honorem merito perderent, si in occasione Martyrii prævaricatores Evangelii esse voluissent: Nam qui quod habet non Custodit in eo ex quo possidet, dum id ex quo possidet violat, violat illud quod possidebat. Ep. 30. p. 68.

(q) — Si aliud Evangelium aliud autem Martyres dicunt posuisse decretum collidentes contra Evangelium Martyres utrobique periclitabuntur — illud præterea velle-mus addiscere, si Martyres non propter aliud Martyres fiunt nisi ut non Sacrificantes; teneant Ecclesiæ usque ad effusionem Sanguinis sui PACEM; ne cruciatus dolore superati perdendo PACEM, perdant, salutem, quam, si Sacrificassent, se habituros non putaverunt; illis existiment donandum, qui Sacrificasse dicantur: Cum legem hanc debeant in aliis tenere quam ipsi videbantur sibi ante posuisse? In quo Negotio hoc ipsum quod pro seipsis facere putaverunt animadvertimus contra seipsos protulisse Nam si dandum illis (Lapsis) PACEM Martyres putaverunt, cur ipsi non dederunt? cur illos ad EPISCOPUM, ut ipsi dicunt, remittendos censuerunt? Is enim qui jubet fieri, potest utique facere quod fieri jubet. The Sense whereof is plainly this, That the Martyrs and Confessors have no Power to give Peace to the Lapsers; all they can do is, to petition the Bishop, who has Power to do it (it is Ep. 36. p. 70.) And who is not bound to do it at any Requests of Martyrs or Confessors, unless he finds it both Reasonable and Seasonable, according to that of our Martyr (De Lapsis. p. 130.) Adeo non omne quod petitur in præjudicio PETENTIS, sed in DANTIS arbitrio est. The Petitioner by his Petition can lay no necessity on the Party petitioned to grant what is petition'd for.

§ LXIV.

(r) INSTE-
TUR Episto-
lis quas ad
vos proximè
feceram: quarum exem-
plum COL-
LEGIS
quoque multis
jam misi qui
rescripserunt
placere sibi
quod ST A-
TUIMUS
(en Martyrum
nostrum per se
Statuentem)
Nec ab eo re-
cedendum esse.
Ep. 26. p. 51.
(c) Supra.
(t) Persecutio-

AS the Roman Clergy and Confessors did thus reclaim against the *Presumption* of the *Carthaginian* or rather *African Confessors*, so, generally, the Bishops did not think fit in the least, to *Regard*, either their *Forms* or their *Petitions*, but to continue the *Laspers* in their Course of *Satisfactions*, according to the ancient *Canons*, and *Methods* of *Discipline*. St. *Cyprian* tells his *Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the first Letter he wrote to them, after he had received the aforesaid *Petulant Epistle* from *Lucianus*, in name of all the *Confessors*, that he had sent Copies of *Ep. 18*: and *19*. (the Contents whereof have been already accounted for) to many of his *COLLEGUES*; and that they had written back to him, that his *Resolution* (the *Form* he had given to his *P P.* and *D D.*) pleased them, and was not so bereceded from (r). And when the *Persecution* relented, and the Times were so peaceable, that *Provincial Synods* might meet, it was *Decreed*, both in *Africa* and *Rome*, by *Great Convocations* of *Bishops*, that the *Laspers* should complete their *Satisfactions*, as has already been shown in the *General(s)*. Our Martyrs words to *Antonianus* are *Weighty* and *Emphatick*: Those *Synods* determined, that none of the *Laspers* should be rashly *Reconciled*, but that their *Pennances* should be drawn out to a great Length, &c. (t) I could give a more particular account, if it were needful, of divers of the *Canons* were then made, and shew thereby how little the (whether *Petitions* or) *Forms* of *Martyrs* and *Confessors* were regarded. But methinks what I have said is enough to satisfy any Man, that all the *Interest* even the *Martyrs* and *Confessors* themselves had in Church Government and *Discipline*, amounted to no more than *Petitioning*, not at all to *Voting*; which was the thing I under-

ne fignita
Copiosus Episcoporum Numerus—in unum Convenimus—& temperamentum libravimus ut nec in totum Spes Communicationis & Pacis Lapsis denegaretur, ne plus desperatione deficerent—nec tamen rursus censura Evangelica solveretur, ut ad Communicationem temere profilirent, sed traheretur diu Pœnitentia, & rogaretur dolenter paterna Clementia, & examinarentur Causæ & Voluntates & Necessitates singulorum. Ep. 55. p. 102, 103.

§ LXV.

THE Conclusion of this Argument I have so long insisted on, is so obvious, that to name it is more than enough. Yet name it I shall; it is, that the *People* could have no *Definitive Voices* in Matters of Government or *Discipline*, in the days

Days of St. Cyprian. How could the *Rest* have it, when those who were *most Eminent*, those who were *most Regarded*, those who had *Prerogatives* above the *Rest*, had it not? But what needs more? We have plain and clear Testimonies in the Monuments of that Age, that to *Address*, to *Petition*, to *Pray* to the Bishops in Matters relating to Government and Discipline, was all the *People* could pretend to. The *Lapsers* wrote a bold and presumptuous Letter to our Martyr, in a Threatning Stile, as if they had design'd to *Force* him to *Restore* them to the Church's *Peace*; as we learn from *Ep. 33*. Of this Letter he forthwith sent an account to the *Roman Clergy*, *Ep. 35*. Who in their Answer to him, *Ep. 36*. have this Reflection on it; that the *Letters of the Lapsers* had been much more becoming, if the *PRAYERS* of the *STANTES*, the *Intercessions* of the *Faithful* for them, had been backed with *Humility* in them; because that which is asked, is the more easily obtained, when he, for whom it is asked or petitioned for, is worthy that that which is asked should be obtained (u). Here it is of the *Stantes* indefinitely, that is, of all those of the *People* who were not *Lapsers*. And *Cornelius* tells *Fabius* Bishop of *Antioch*, that *He* and his *Colleagues* about *Rome*, had taken off the Sentence of *Excommunication* from off One of the *Three Bishops* who ordained *Novatianus*, and restor'd him to *Lay Communion*, because *All the People*, *Besought*, *Intreated*, and *Prayed* (not at all, *Voted*) that it might be done (v). And *St. Cyprian*, and other *66 Bishops* with him, in a *Synodical Epistle* written to *Fidus*, make it one *Aggravation* of Bishop *Therapins* his *Error*, in the *Precipitant Absolution* of *Victor*, a *Presbyter* who had *lapsed*, that he had done it, when there was no *PETITION* of the *People* for it (w). It had so intirely proceeded from himself, that he had not been so much as *Importun'd* to it.

(u) Quanto meliores ipsorum literæ fuissent si pro ipsis PETENTIBUS STANTIBUS humiliter ipsorum adjutus fuissent, quoniam & facilius impetratur quod PETITUR, quando is pro quo PETITUR indignus est ut quod PETITUR impetretur.

(v) ὅτι ἡ ἐκκλησία οὐκ ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ἀφεσίν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ἀντιθέτον πάντας τοὺς λαοὺς. Apud Euseb. Lib. 6. Cap. 43.

(w) Quæ res nos satis movit, secessum à Decreti nostri auctoritate, ut ante legitimum & plenum tempus Satisfactionis, & sine PETITU & Conscientia Plebis, nulla infirmitate Urgente, aut Necessitate Cogente pax ei (*Victori à Therapio Episcopo*) concederetur. *Ep. 64. (Pamel. 59) p. 158.*

SUCH was the Interest of the *People*, in matters of § LVI. Church Government. Why then (perhaps some may ask)

K k k 2

fo

so much Noise, in those times, about the People? why all the People so often mention'd as being present? as being Judges? as being consulted? &c. was this all the *Mutual Honor* amounted to? For answer, in short, whatever *Interest* the People had besides *Petitioning*, was, without doubt, short of *Authoritative Defining*. No Shadow of an Evidence of any such Power lodg'd in the People in the Monuments of that Age. And it requires no great Depth of thinking, to come by a plain and just Understanding of whatever Interest they had. The Bishops of those times, upon many Prudential Considerations, some, perhaps, common to all Ages, others peculiar to their own Times and Circumstances, were willing to give all proper and reasonable Satisfaction to the People, concerning, sometimes, the Necessity, sometimes, the Expediency, always, the Equity of whatever Resolutions they took, or Orders they appointed, or Methods they chose, or Decrees they made, or Canons they enacted, or Sentences they formed, or Censures they inflicted; in a Word, of their whole Administration of the Government: Nay, 'tis very credible, that they were very tender of doing any thing that might *Cross* the *People's Inclinations*: 'Tis credible they seldom, or never did it, but when the People were notoriously unreasonable. They were willing, and it was their Wisdom to live in Concord and good Correspondence with the People: Not to offend them, not to provoke them, not to embitter them. Whatever Allowances, therefore, could consist with the Honour and Deference due to Paternal Authority, they were willing to grant to the People. But it was very well consistent with the Honour and Regards due to such Authority, that as many of the People as pleas'd, and was convenient, should be present even in *Provincial Councils*, to be Witnesses of what was done in them. It was no ways incontinent with the Interests and Exigencies of Authority, even to allow such of the People as pretended to have them, to propose reasonable Overtures or reasonable Objections. It was in many Cases necessary, that from the People they should receive Informations and Testimonies concerning Matters of Fact. I do not pretend to be able to reckon up all the possible *Congruities* there might have been for allowing as many of the People as pleas'd to be present. Tho' I could, I'm sure 'tis not necessary. For, from what I have hinted at, it may be easie to account for all the *Interests* men-

mention'd in the Cyprianic Monuments, as belonging to the People, without allowing them the *Unaccountable Interest* of a *Definitive Voice*, of a *Potestative Authority*. To be allowed to give *Advice* is one Thing, and to *Define* is Another. There is a great Difference between *Debating* and *Determining*. And if the People were allowed to be *present*, they could not be hindered to *judge*, unless their *Natures* had been *Changed*; it being *Natural* to Men, as they are *Men*, to have their own *Judgment* of every thing that comes to their *Knowledge*. But to *judge* as a *Man*, and to *judge* as a *Man* in *Authority*, are very different things. And when a *Publick Authoriz'd Judge*, a *Judge Sovereign*, or a *Judge by Commission*, pronounces *Publick* and *Authoritative Judgment* agreeably to the *Private Judgments* of those that are *present*, he *judges* according to their *Arbitriment*, that is, he *judges* as they themselves, following their *Light*, would have *judged*, had they been in his *Circumstances*. By this time, I think all contain'd in the *Objection* is sufficiently accounted for, except one Thing, or rather one *Phrase*.

IT is that *Phrase* so much insisted on, [*Sicut mutuus Honor possit*] as *Mutual Honour* requires. I have already shewn, that the *People* had as great *Interest* in this *Mutual Honour*, as *Presbyters*. That which I am concern'd for, *Now*, is, that it doth not, cannot import, that the *People* had the *Prerogative* of a *Definitive Voice* in *Provincial Synods*. I say, in *Provincial Synods*: for, that *St. Cyprian* had a *Provincial Synod* in his *Eye*, when he wrote the Sentence whereof this *Phrase* is apart, is clear as *Light*: *When, by God's Grace, I shall come to you* (Return to Carthage) *then, as Mutual Honour requires, we shall in common consider both what has been, and what is to be done* (x). viz. Concerning the *Lapsers*. The *Phrase* of *Considering in Common* is his ordinary *Phrase* concerning *Provincial Synods*: And it was all along to such *Synods* that he referred the *Determination* of the *Case* of the *Lapsers*, as hath been already clear'd beyond *Controversie* (y). But it is with regard to their *Interest* in a *Provincial Synod*, that this *Phrase* was usurped by our *Martyr*, then, to be sure, it was not the *Honour* of a *Definitive Suffrage*. What I have discoursed makes that more than incredible, what is it then? The *Great Mr. Hooker* has rendered it pretty appositely. *Sicut mutuus Honor possit*, says he, i. e. *As the Law*

(x) Cum ad vos per Dei Gratiam venero, tunc de iis quæ vel gesta sunt vel gerenda sicut mutuus honor possit, in commune tractabimus
Ep. 14 p. 33.
(y) Supra

A Vindication of a Discourse Entitled,

(z) Ecclef. Polit. last Edit. p. 386.

of Courtesie which one doth owe to another of us requireth (z). As many of the People as pleas'd, were Courteously allow'd by the Bishops to be present, and Witnesses of what pass'd in Synods: And the Foot on which this Courteous Retribution of Respect or Regard was founded, was not any Divine Institution, no Reference to any such Institution made any where by our Martyr, or any of his Contemporaries. No such Institution can be produced. It was a Prudential Concession of an Honorary Privilege to the People, *pro fide & timore suo*, as our Martyr words it; for their continuing unshaken in their Profession of the Faith, and in the Fear of God.

§ LXVIII.

I SAY, as many of the People as pleas'd, that is, there was none of the *Stantes Laici* had any special Privilege in this matter. No One had more Right to be present than Another; no One was Excluded from this Honour more than Another. Dionysius the Great, Bishop of Alexandria, St. Cyprian's Contemporary, has express'd it fully and plainly, when he tells, that upon a certain Occasion, being in a certain Place, where a certain Controversie was very warmly agitated; so warmly as to make schisms, &c. For the Settlement thereof, he convoked the Presbyters and Teachers of the Brethren, who lived in the Neighbouring Villages, as

(a) Παρόντων
ἐκ τῶν βυαυ-
αίων Ἀδελ-
φῶν. Apud
Euseb. H. E. L.
7. C. 24.

many of the Brethren (the Laity) as would, being present (a). So likewise in the great Synod of Carthage, Anno 256. consisting of LXXXVII Bishops, frequently mentioned above, it is not said, that all the People were present: But [*Præsentæ etiam Plebis maxima parte*] And even as it is worded, it is to be understood, with a reasonable allowance of Latitude. The word [*maxima*] though it have the Form of the Superlative, yet without doubt has only the Signification of the Positive Degree. The Phrase doth not import, that either almost All or the greatest Part of the Faithful of 87 Dioceses were present. That, I have already shewn to be utterly incredible. No more therefore is meant, than that there was a goodly Congregation of the People there: And a goodly Congregation there might have been, though none there, but of the Diocese of Carthage. Nay, though not the Tenth Man of that neither. And,

§ LXIX.

A S not all, but so many of the People as would, and could conveniently, were Present in Provincial Synods; so certainly

it was as to *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. Who can imagine that all the *Presbyters* and *Deacons* of the LXXXVII *Dioceses*, as well as the *Bishops*, were congregated in *Carthage*, on that Occasion? What had become of the Service of the Church and the Publick Worship of God, at Home? Neither is there the least Intimation of any *Authoriz'd* by *Commission* to Represent *Presbyters* in *Provincial Synods*, in any Monuments of that Age. Every *Presbytery*, or rather, every *Diocesan Church* was Represented by its *Bishop*. Neither this by Virtue of any *Commission* from either *Presbytery* or *People*; but in his own Right; and as the Person *Cloath'd* with all the *Prerogatives* accounted for in the preceeding Chapter. But there is no need of insisting largely here: There is one of our Martyr's Epistles which is sufficient to clear the whole Matter.

WHEN *Cornelius* was promoted to the *Bishoprick* of § LXX. *Rome*, according to the Custom, he, forthwith, gave an account thereof to all other *Bishops*; that they might know by whom the *See* was filled, and to whom, thereafter, they were to direct their Communicatory Letters, &c. But he had a Clamorous Competitor, *Novatianus*, who was as busie as he could (and none can be more than Schismatics) to make as big Pretensions to the *Roman Bishoprick*. Hereupon, an *African Synod* was convoked: Wherein, Resolved that Two of their Number, *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, should be sent to *Rome* to Enquire into the Competition; and distinctly learn, whether *Cornelius* or *Novatianus* was the True *Bishop*; and that till their Return, Neither should be written to as *Bishop* of *Rome*; but all Letters, as formerly, during the Vacancy of the *See*, should be directed for the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. The *Presbyters* of *Adrumetum*, ignorant of the Competition at *Rome*, ignorant of what had been Resolved upon in the *African Synod*, in the absence of their own *Bishop Polycarpus*, write a Letter to *Cornelius* as *Bishop* of *Rome*, thereby owning his Title. Shortly thereafter, St. *Cyprian* and his Colleague *Liberalis*, having occasion to be at *Adrumetum*, acquaint the *Presbyters* and *Deacons* of that Church with, both the Competition at *Rome*, and the Resolution of the *African Synod*. Hereupon, the next Letter they send to *Rome* is directed (not, as the former, to *Cornelius*, but

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

but, as during the Vacancy) to the *Roman Presbyters and Deacons*. This offends *Cornelius*; and, knowing it was *St. Cyprian* who had made them alter their *Stile* and *Direction*, he challenges him for it. *St. Cyprian* to satisfy *Cornelius*, writes back to him deducing the Matter as I have

(b) Legi represented it (b). Now that which I observe, is, that none of the *Presbyters* nor *Deacons* of the Church of *Adrumetum* had been present in the *African Synod*. Had either all of them been there, or any One, or Two or Three, with Commission to represent the rest, how could they All have been *Ignorant* of such a *Singular* and *Remarkable Resolution* of the *Synod*? But what needs more? Our Martyr manifestly impunes their *Ignorance* to the *Absence* of their Bishop *Polycarpus*: Clearly importing, that the Bishops only, and none of the *Presbyters* nor *Deacons* of *Remote Dioceses* (such as *Adrumetum* was, yet not so Remote as many others) used to come to the *Provincial Synods*, which were commonly holden in *Carthage*. The Bishop of any *Diocese* was sufficient to represent it in the Synod. And, if he was *absent*, his *Clergy* were *Ignorant* of what passed, till otherwise informed. Whatsoever *Presbyters*, therefore, or *Deacons* were present in such *Synods*, were only those of *Carthage*, or the next Neighbourhood: Few or none (unless they had particular Business) from the *Remoter Dioceses*. Neither any need of those who were *Present*, for any *Interest* they had in *Synodical Definitions*; for any *Right* they had to *Define* more than the *People*.

literas tuas-- in quibus te comperi motum, quod cum de Adrumetina colonia, Polycarpi nomine, A D T E literæ Dirigentur, posteaquam nos, Ego & Liberales in eundem locum venissemus, coepissent illuc ad Presbyteros & Diaconos literæ dirigi. Quod scire te volumus & pro certo credere, nulla id levitate aut Contumelia factum: Sed cum statuissemus Collegæ complures, qui in unum conveneramus, ut Legatis ad vos Coepiscopis nostris Caldonio & Fortunato missis, omnia interim integra Suspenderentur; donec ad nos iidem Collegæ nostri, rebus illic aut ad pacem redactis, aut pro veritate compertis, redirent. Presbyteri & Diaconi in Adrumetina consistentes Polycarpo Coepiscopo nostro absente, ignorabant quid nobis in commune placuisset. At ubi nos in præsentiam venimus, comperto Consilio nostro (Synodico) ipsi quoque quod & cæteri, observare cœperunt: ut in nullo Ecclesiarum istic consistentium consensio discreparet. Ep. 48. (Pamel. 45.) p. 90, 91.

§LXXI.

THUS I have somewhat fully (and, as I think, clearly) shewn, that the *People*, in the Days of *St. Cyprian*, had no *Authoritative* or *Potestative Interest*, no *Power of Defining*, in *Provincial Synods*; and have thereby (as I take it) not only overthrown the Foundations of *Independency*, at least,

at

as to that Age; but also weakened, if not quite evacuated the Force of Mr. Blondel's laboriously collected Discourse, *Concerning the Right of the People in the Government of the Church*. I am confident, I have intirely disabled it as to the *Cyprianic Age*; an Age he lays as much Stress on as any (c). I have likewise shewn, that *Presbyters*, as to a *Definitive Voice*, in *Provincial Synods*, had no more Right than the *People*. It remains then, that *Bishops*, and *Bishops alone were Definers* in such *Synods*: And by Consequence, had the *Sole Power* of *Legislation*, of making *Canons* with Regard to *Provinces*. Much more might have been said for it: But what needs more? *Blondel* himself (than whom no Author more unwilling to grant any *Prerogatives* to Primitive *Bishops*, which he thought could be colourably kept from them) is forced to confess, that in all those Councils the Records whereof are extant, for the first 800 Years (some few obscure ones excepted, whereof none within a Century and an half of the *Cyprianic Age*) *Bishops alone did sit and Define, and never so much as one Presbyter, unless by the Mandatè, and in name of his Bishop* (d). And so much for the Interest of *Bishops* in *Provincial Councils*, in the Days of *St. Cyprian*.

(c) Vide de jure Plebis, &c. Edit. Amsterdam. An. 1677. p. 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278.

(d) In Universis quorum nunc Regulas habemus (si

forte Antistiodorense Gallorum, Becanceldense Anglorum, Romanaque aliquot sub Hilario, Felice III. Gelasio, Symmacho, Gregorio Primo, Agathone, Gregorio, III. Zacharia, &c. excipias) ad Annum 800. Congregatis Conciliis, Episcopi fere soli & Sederunt & Decreverunt; nec ullus nisi Antistitis sui Mandato ac nomine Presbyter interfuit. Apol. pro Sent. Hieron. p. 177. 178.

GENERAL Councils (if ever there were any properly such) there were none, neither in the *Cyprianic*, nor the preceding Age; nor for more than LX Years after the Death of our Martyr. Whatever *Canons*, therefore, or *Customs* were in Force all the *Catholic Church* over, had either descended from the *Apostles*, or had had their Rise from *Provincial Synods*, or *Epistolar Correspondence*. So that, it must be obvious to collect from what hath been discoursed, how much such *Canons* or *Customs* depended on the *Sovereign Power* of *Bishops*, and how little on the *Power* of either *Presbyters* or *People*.

I SHOULD now proceed to the *Power of Jurisdiction*, the Executive Power, and shew, what a Sovereign Interest, by the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*, the *Bishop* had in it.

And here it were easie to insist very largely. I might Resume all the Acts I pursu'd in the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*, and not only vindicate them from the little Exceptions of *G. R.* but farther confirm them. I might likewise insist on a great many more, particularly, I might shew, that Bishops only were Judges of Bishops, and Reason too; seeing they made an *Order* Superiour to all other *Orders*, and were combined in a *College* different from all other *Colleges*. I had once, indeed, resolv'd to shew, that every Bishop, within his own *Diocese*, had the Sovereign Power of enjoining Penances, and granting Indulgences, and reconciling or absolving Penitents, &c. And I remember I have made some References to this Place, where I design'd to represent these things fully. But now, when I consider that these things are so obviously colligible from what hath been discoursed; and withal, that this Work has already swell'd to a Bulk very much greater than, at first, I projected; I ask leave to forbear the Prosecution of all these at present; in the mean time hereby giving my Word to *G. R.* or any of his Brethren, that, with God's Allowance and Assistance, I shall give them what may satisfie them, on any of the Points named, when they shall put me to it. And now,

§ LXXIV.

That I may bring this final Overthrow of *G. R.*'s *Main Subterfuge* to something like an handsom Conclusion: I will adventure to do it with a *Syllogism*. The Reason, this After, by divers Considerations, I had made it (as I thought and do still think) Demonstratively to appear, that by the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*, every Bishop was the *Principle of Unity* to his own Church (e); I added in the last Place, that such a Principle was most Reasonable and Accountable, from Principles I had before laid down (f). At this *G. R.* falls into an odd Fit of *Vapouring*. He says, *He is willing that the whole Controversie between us be hang'd on this Pin* (g). I think I have as good Reason to be Confident, as he has. But I will not be so Rash, as to hang the whole Controversie on any One Pin; or drown it in any One Ditch. My side of it hangs (I think) on so many strong Pins, that it might be Firm and Fix'd enough, though I should, for Peace, forbear to contend with him for more than One of them.

§ LXXV.

HE would have his Reader fancy, that I had entertain'd the extravagant Conceit, that it was necessary, that in every

every
be its
Form
Demo
thing
my
naugh
and a
to th
Now
neith
such
Sub-p
been
who
Arm
ever,
one f

H
acco
acco
raign
VII.
look
Chur
B
parti
for,
Cha
Gov
E
most
the
was

every Society there should be *One Singular Person* who should be its *Principle of Unity*: The Maggot, that there can be no *Form of Government* but *Monarchy*; and that *Aristocracy* or *Democracy* are *Impossible* (h): Whereas, as there was no such thing in my *Head*, so neither was there any *Shadow* of it in my *Argument*. Neither is this all: My *Argument* was naught: There were no fewer than *Three Premises expressed*, and a *Fourth necessarily understood*, before one could come to the *Conclusion*, which every *Logician* will condemn (i). (h) Ibid. p. 42. (i) Ibid. p. 41. 42.

Now, good *Material Reasoning* was all I aim'd at: I was neither thinking on *Barbara's* nor *Bocardo's*. And what though such a *Schoolboy* (as I am) who had never been *Regent*, *Sub-principal*, nor *Principal* in any *College of Philosophy*, had been a little *Shy* to engage about *Syllogistic Forms* with *G. R.* who had so remarkably *Adorn'd* all these *Stations*? A Man *Arm'd* these *50 Years Cap à pie* with *Moods and Figures*? However, seeing he is so *Keen* upon the *Scent of Syllogisms*, here is one for him.

HE who, in any particular Church, had *all the Powers* accounted for, above, Chap. V. And *all the Prerogatives* accounted for, Chap. VI. And could perform *all the Sovereign Acts* of Government accounted for, or nam'd in this VII. Chap. Him it was most *Reasonable* and *Accountable* to look upon as the *Principle of Unity* to that particular Church.

BUT, by the *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, in every particular Church, the *Bishop* had *all the Powers* accounted for, above, Chap. V. And *all the Prerogatives* accounted for, Chap. VI. And could perform *all the Sovereign Acts* of Government accounted for or named in this VII. Chap.

ERGO, by the *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, it was most *Reasonable* and *Accountable*, to look upon the *Bishop* as the *Principle of Unity* to that particular Church, whereof he was *Bishop*.

And here it were easie to insist very largely. I might Resume all the Acts I pursu'd in the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*, and not only vindicate them from the little Exceptions of *G. R.* but farther confirm them. I might likewise insist on a great many more, particularly, I might shew, that Bishops only were Judges of Bishops, and Reason too; seeing they made an *Order* Superiour to all other *Orders*, and were combined in a *College* different from all other *Colleges*. I had once, indeed, resolv'd to shew, that every Bishop, within his own *Diocese*, had the Sovereign Power of enjoining Penances, and granting Indulgences, and reconciling or absolving Penitents, &c. And I remember I have made some References to this Place, where I design'd to represent these things fully. But now, when I consider that these things are so obviously colligible from what hath been discoursed; and withal, that this Work has already swell'd to a Bulk very much greater than, at first, I projected; I ask leave to forbear the Prosecution of all these at present; in the mean time hereby giving my Word to *G. R.* or any of his Brethren, that, with God's Allowance and Assistance, I shall give them what may satisfie them, on any of the Points named, when they shall put me to it. And now,

§ LXXIV.

That I may bring this final Overthrow of *G. R.*'s *Main Subterfuge* to something like an handsom Conclusion: I will adventure to do it with a *Syllogism*. The Reason, this After, by divers Considerations, I had made it (as I thought and do still think) Demonstratively to appear, that by the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*, every Bishop was the *Principle of Unity* to his own Church (e); I added in the last Place, that such a Principle was most *Reasonable and Accountable*, from Principles I had before laid down (f). At this *G. R.* falls into an odd Fit of *Vapouring*. He says, *He is willing that the whole Controversie between us be hanged on this Pin* (g). I think I have as good Reason to be *Confident*, as he has. But I will not be so *Rash*, as to hang the whole Controversie on any *One Pin*; or *drown* it in any *One Ditch*. My side of it hangs (I think) on so many *strong Pins*, that it might be Firm and Fix'd enough, though I should, for Peace, forbear to contend with him for more than *One* of them.

§ LXXV.

HE would have his Reader fancy, that I had entertain'd the extravagant Conceit, that it was necessary, that in every

(e) Prin. Cyp. Age. p. 18. ad 26.

(f) Ibid. p. 27.

(g) Cyp. B. Ex.

§ 32. p. 41.

every
be its
Form
Demo
thing
my
naugh
and a
to the
Now,
neithe
such
Sub-p
been
who
Arm's
ever,
one fo
H
accou
accou
raign
VII. C
look
Chur
B
partic
for,
Chap
Gov
E
most
the
was

every Society there should be *One Singular Person* who should be its *Principle of Unity*: The Maggot, that there can be no *Form of Government* but *Monarchy*; and that *Aristocracy* or *Democracy* are *Impossible* (b): Whereas, as there was no such thing in my *Head*, so neither was there any *Shadow* of it in my *Argument*. Neither is this all: My *Argument* was naught: There were no fewer than *Three Premises expressed*, and a *Fourth necessarily understood*, before one could come to the *Conclusion*, which every *Logician* will condemn (i). Now, good *Material Reasoning* was all I aim'd at: I was neither thinking on *Barbara's* nor *Bocardo's*. And what though such a *Schoolboy* (as I am) who had never been *Regent*, *Sub-principal*, nor *Principal* in any *College of Philosophy*, had been a little *Shy* to engage about *Syllogistic Forms* with *G. R.* who had so remarkably *Adorn'd* all these *Stations*? A Man *Arm'd* these 50 Years *Cap à p'e* with *Moods* and *Figures*? However, seeing he is so *Keen* upon the *Scent* of *Syllogisms*, here is one for him. (b) Ibid. p. 42. (i) Ib. p. 41. 42.

HE who, in any particular Church, had *all the Powers* accounted for, above, Chap. V. And *all the Prerogatives* accounted for, Chap. VI. And could perform *all the Sovereign Acts* of Government accounted for, or nam'd in this VII. Chap. Him it was most *Reasonable* and *Accountable* to look upon as the *Principle of Unity* to that particular Church.

BUT, by the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*, in every particular Church, the *Bishop* had *all the Powers* accounted for, above, Chap. V. And *all the Prerogatives* accounted for, Chap. VI. And could perform *all the Sovereign Acts* of Government accounted for or named in this VII. Chap.

ERGO, by the *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*, it was most *Reasonable* and *Accountable*, to look upon the *Bishop* as the *Principle of Unity* to that particular Church, whereof he was *Bishop*.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

CHAP. VIII.

G. R.'s Third Main Subterfuge Stated and Defeated.

§ I.

THOUGH I do not intend to insist long on this Subterfuge, yet I am here (as always) to deal honestly with both G. R. and my Reader. I will therefore give an account of it in G. R.'s own words, only interweaving, as 'tis proper, the occasions of his having Recourse to it. I had proved sufficiently (and have now (a) done it more fully) that it was a received Principle in St. Cyprian's time, that there could be but One Bishop at Once in a Church: And concluded from it, that a Bishop was something Other, and something More than a single Presbyter, because, e. g. in those Days, the Church of Rome was but One Church, and the Church of Carthage, another; and yet in each of these Churches there were many single Presbyters (b). To this G. R. returns four Answers: But 'tis only the Fourth I am at present concern'd in. It is, that There might be a Plurality of Presbyters in a particular Congregation; not only Presbyters that were only Ruling, but Preachers also: For it is observed by some (says he) that, in the Primitive Times, they ordained many more preaching Presbyters in Churches than they had present Work for. And for this having cited Mr. Clerkson, he proceeds thus, It is probable (N.B.) that then the Christians, having no Universities, the Churches, especially in great Cities, or where were learned Bishops, were Colleges for breeding Men to the Ministry, and that when they were Ripe, they Ordain'd and Employ'd them, that so they might be Seminaries out of which vacant Parishes might be provided: And if any say, that the Bishops had such Authority over these Presbyters, as our Professors of Divinity have over the Students, it may pass (N.B.) for a probable Conjecture: Only these were ordained; Ours we do not ordain till we fix them in Churches (c). I am not at Leisure to animadvert on this Discourse as it furnishes Occasions. All I consider is, that here you have a Tripartite Distinction of Presbyters: Two Sorts expressly nam'd, Ruling Elders; and a certain kind of Unfix'd Ones, without Charges; and the Third Sort, viz. Fix'd Presbyters, having

Charges,

(a) Supra Cap. VI. § XVII.

(b) Prin. Cyp. Age. p. 11. 12, 15,

(c) Cyp. B. Exam. § 24. p. 29.

Charges, i. e. Parish Ministers, under the name of Bishops. Only, note here, that there were Three other Shadows, (if so much as Shadows) of Answers; so that the whole Stress was not to lie on this goodly Tripartite Distinction? And therefore it is only *Probable*, there were Presbyters of the Second Sort, and we are only desired to let it pass for a *Probable Conjecture*, that Parish Ministers had some Authority over those *Unfix'd* Presbyters.

W H A T cannot Courage do when hard put to it? The *511*. Matter is; I had affirm'd, and proved too, that the Bishops in St. Cyprian's time had such a Sovereign Power, that Presbyters could neither Baptize nor Administer the Eucharist without their Allowance (d). And there was no way to avoid the Force of my Arguments, but by improving *Probabilities* into *Certainties*, and *Conjectures* into *Solid Foundations*; and therefore 'tis done. Take his own Words. For a Foundation to our Answer to all his Discourse on this Head, I shall remind the Reader of a Distinction above-mentioned. They were, in Cyprian's time, of three Sorts. 1. The Ruling Elders, who were no Preachers, and who with the Bishop (or Parish Minister) and other preaching Presbyters, (if there were any) made up the Consistory, by which the Affairs of the Congregation were managed. These I confess could administer no Sacrament, neither without nor with the Bishops License. --- 2. There were in some Churches (especially in great Cities) some Presbyters who were ordain'd to the Work of the Ministry, but had no particular Charge, and were as our Probationers, or Students in Divinity-Schools (only with this Difference, that ours are not ordain'd) these might not Baptize, nor Administer the Eucharist, yet nor preach without the Allowance of the Bishop or Parish Minister: And it is so also among us: If some ordain'd Ministers happen to live in a Parish, whereof they are not Pastors (as sometimes falleth out in great Cities) it is disorderly for them to exercise their Ministry within another Mans Charge, without his Call or Allowance. These Presbyters in Cyprian's time were, in some things, like Evangelists, whom the Bishops employ'd, when themselves could not overtake all their Work: And if these be called the Bishops Curates, as our Author doth all Presbyters (for this I have already (e) accounted) I shall not much reclaim. --- 3. A Third Sort of Presbyters were the Ministers of the several Parishes, &c. (f) Thus you

(d) Prin. Cyp. Age. p. 50. 51, 52, 53. 54.

(e) Supra Cap. 11. § XXI.
(f) Cyp. B. Exam. p. 70.
have 71. § 48.

A Vindication of a Discourse Entitled,

have again our *Tripartite Distinction* of Presbyters, *sine Formidine*, without weakening its Virtues by such cowardly Concomitants as *Probabilities* or *Probable Conjectures*. And now what can it not *Outface*? It sweeps *Tertullian's* famous Testimony so often mentioned before, (*Dandi quidem jus, &c.*) clean off the Stage (g). And *Dionysius's* too (h). Nay, all my Arguments for proving, that in *St. Cyprian's* time, all the Church Governours within any Bishop's District, Presbyters as well as others, were subject to his Authority, and obnoxious to his Discipline (i). All these Arguments I say, must vanish into nothing, upon its very Appearance (k). And lastly, what though *Cyprian* was shy, sometimes, to call Presbyters his *Collegues*? for, if it be understood of Presbyters without a Charge there is reason for it, &c. (l)

(g) See *Tertullian's* Testimony above and *G. R's* Application of his Distinction to it, in his *Cyp. B. Examined*. § 49. p. 72.

(h) See *Dionysius of Alexandria's* Testimony. *Prin. Cyp. Age*. p. 53, 54.

Cyp. B. Exam. § 50. p. 73.

(i) See my Arguments *Prin. Cyp. Age*. p. 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77.

(k) See how *G. R's* Distinction comes up to them *Cyp. B. Exam.* § 56. p. 84.

(l) See *Cyp. B. Exam.* § 62. p. 94.

§ III.

HOW lucky is the Wight that is so girded for his Work! that has such a powerful Distinction at Command upon so many important Occasions! But to our Task. How is the Distinction founded? what Ground doth it stand on? Let us briefly try it as to Two of its Members, the *Unfix'd Presbyters*, and the *Ruling Elders*: For I have already shewn, that no simple Presbyter fixed or unfixed, was ever called a Bishop in the Days of *St. Cyprian*: So that his Third Member is already ruin'd: And though it had escap'd, the Distinction can be in no good Condition, if, consisting only of Three Members, Two of them shall be sent packing.

§ IV.

I. THEN, begin we with his *Unfix'd Presbyters*, those who were in Orders, and could preach, and administer Sacraments, but had no Charges, &c. Has he prov'd there were any such in *St. Cyprian's* time? Not so much as attempted to do it. What then? Referred me to *Paul Bayn's Diocesans Tryal*, p. 63. And thither I have gone: But what have I learn'd? Two things. 1. To admire *G. R's* Skill in it; for *Paul Bayn's* Presbyters over whom he gives Bishops some Power, are not at all *G. R's* *Unfix'd Ones*. They are a kind of Presbyters, who, he says, were numbred amongst the Bishops

Cl-

Clericks, and were Helps to him in the Liturgy, in Chappels and Parishes which did depend on him as their proper Teacher.——
A Corruption he takes them to have been of Governing Presbyters (Ruling Elders who use not to be ordain'd by any Men, ad Ministerium Vagum) who came to be made a Humane Ministry (you have his Words as his Book affords them)
 1. by having singular Acts permitted. 2. By being consecrate to this, and so doing ex Officio, what they were employ'd in by the Bishop. They were but Helps (again) to the Liturgy, according to the Canons: Preaching did not agree to them farther than it could be delegated or permitted. Finally we read (continues he) that by Law it was permitted them: that it was taken away from them again by the Bishops: that it was stinted and limited sometime as to the Opening of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed and the Ten Commandments. Thus he describes them, p. 61. and then p. 63. he says again, that they were part of the Bishop's Clerks, in a great measure subject to him, absolutely in a manner for their Direction.——They lived under his Conduct, a Collegiate Life together. Eodem refectorio & dormitorio utebantur, & Canonicè viventes ab Episcopo instruebantur. Now when all such Clerks did live then as Members of a College, under a Master, it is no wonder if they be called Headless who did belong to no Bishop, &c. This is Paul Bayn's account: A pretty obscure one indeed, and of a pretty odd sort of Presbyters: However, so obviously, as well as vastly different from G. R.'s, that any ordinary Reader, without any Help, may easily observe, they were not One and the Same. But this is not all; I have learnt, 2. That unless you take the above-written Latin Sentence (which for any thing I know may have been his own, for he names no Author for it) for sufficient Proof; P. Bayn has been even as Regardless of proving, as G. R. himself; so that tho' their Presbyters had been one and the same, one was never a whit the wiser for being referr'd to P. B. than he shall be, who, next Generation shall be referred to G. R. In short,

AS G. R.'s Unfix'd Presbyters, as he has described them, are s V. not to be found in P. B.'s Diocesans Tryals; so neither are they, in any Monument of the Cyprianic Age; (nor of any Age, for any thing I know) neither *Shew* nor *Shadow* of them: And though he had found them there, or, shall find them

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

them hereafter, they can stand him in no stead: So long as 'tis certain, that the Bishops of that Age had a Real, True, Proper Superiority over Presbyters that were as much *fixed* as 'tis possible for Presbyters to be. Were not those, e.g. the *Fixed Presbyters* of the Church of *Rome*, who govern'd the Church of *Rome*, not only taught the People and administered the Sacraments to them, but managed the Discipline during those 15 or 16 Months of the Vacancy of the Episcopal Chair of *Rome*, between the Death of *Fabianus*, and the Ordination of *Cornelius*? And not only so, but continued (46 of them) as *Office-bearers* of the Church of *Rome* after he was made Bishop? Had not *Novatianus* (even by *Blondel's* own reckoning) been Ten Years a Presbyter of the Church of *Rome* before he set up for Bishop of it? Had he been all that time *Unfixed*? had not *Maximus* been a fixed Presbyter of that Church, who, after he deserted *Novatianus* and returned to the Unity of the Church, was commanded to *take his place again* in the Presbytery? were they not all *Fixed Presbyters* of the Church of *Rome* who were called of the Clergy of *Rome*, and *Sate* every day with the Bishop, and assisted him in the hearing of Causes, in the Management of the whole Government and Discipline, in its ordinary Course? Was there not a Number of *Fixed Presbyters* at *Carthage* when *St. Cyprian*, probably the youngest, was chosen Bishop to the great Provocation of those, who by reason of their having been Presbyters of that Church long before him thought they ought rather to have been preferred? Were they not *Fixed Presbyters* of that Church, who as the *Fixed Presbyters* thereof, sometimes managed, sometimes mismanaged the Government of it during the Two Years of his *Secession*? who but *Fixed Presbyters* made up the Presbytery of *Carthage* before the *Desian* Persecution? Was it not a Society of *Fixed Presbyters* which was *Desolated* in the Days of that Persecution? Was not *Numidicus* joyn'd as a *Fixed Presbyter* to the Presbytery of *Carthage*, to make up its *Desolation*? Who but *Fixed Presbyters* made up the *Confessum* in every Church? Were the Presbyters more *Unfixed* than the Deacons, the Sub-deacons, the Lectors, the *Acolyths*, the *Ostiarii*, any of the Rest of the Clergy? How easie were it to weary my self and my Reader both, with *Invincible Arguments* to this purpose? But I have given
enough

enough in a Case so indisputable. Now these, even these very same *Presbyters, Priests, Administrators of Sacraments*, who were thus *Fixed* in those *Respective Churches*, as much the *Fixed Presbyters*, as the *Bishops themselves* were the *Fixed Bishops* of them; these, I say, were the *Presbyters* who were not *Collegues* but *Subordinate Officers* to their *Bishops*: Who were *Subject* to their *Bishops*, and *Obedient* to their *Discipline*: Who could neither *Baptize* nor *Consecrate* the *Eucharist* without their *Bishop's Allowance*. And so much for *G. R's Unfixed Presbyters*. Come we Next,

II. TO his *Ruling Elders*, an Order of Church Governours contradistinguished from *Pastors*, from *Presbyters* that have Authority to preach and administer *Sacraments*. Here *G. R.* has appeared with more than an ordinary *Keenness*. But I had given him *Provocation*. I had said, there was as profound a *Silence* about such *Ruling Elders* in *St. Cyprian's Works* and *Time*, as of the *Solomon League and Covenant* or the *Sanguhar-Declaration* (m). This made *G. R. buckle*, himself for the *Controversie*, and begin it with the following *Bravado's*; That this my *Sarcasm against Ruling Elders*, sheweth more of my *Spite against that Church-Office* than of my *Skill to refute it* (n). And, it might have been expected from this *Peremptory Confidence*, that I should have attempted a *Refutation* of what many learned Men have written on that *Subject*, if I lookt into that *Controversie* (o). Well! Here I think is *Confidence for Confidence*, and *Sound bearing for a Sooth-board* spoken in *Jest*. A *Sooth-board*, I say, for after all; *G. R.* has not adventured to bring so much as one *Testimony* from *St. Cyprian* for his *Ruling Elders*. But to go on with him. The *London Ministers* (whom I cited) could have taught me at least to *Speak more soberly* (p). Whatever they could have done, they taught me no such thing, in all *in Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, which was their *Book* I cited. There, indeed, with very much *Reason* on their side, they rejected the *Divine Right of Popular Elections* of *Pastors* (q), that was all I cited them for. Nor do I remember that any where in all the *Book*, they engage in the *Controversie* about *Ruling Elders*. There was no place for it, seeing they were the *Independents* they were grappling with.

§ VI.

(m) Prin Cyp. Age. p. 8.

(n) Cyp. B Exam. § 14. p. 13.

(o) Ibid. § 15. p. 19.

(p) Ibid.

(q) Chap. 8.

M m m

BUT

§ VII.

(r) Ubi supra.

BUT Blondel, *de Jure Plebis*, and *Smectymnus*, and L'Arroque, and Calvin, and Peter Martyr, and many latter Writers, had I lookt into them, would have taught me more Sobriety (r). I have seen most of all these, all except L'Arroque; and I have seen Beza, Zeppernus, Gerson Bucer, Altare Damascenum, the Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, and I do not know how many more; and yet I am just where I was. And I must tell G. R. I am mistaken, if he may not find as many of his Friends (I mean Presbyterians) against, as for the Divine Right of the Order of Ruling Elders. Sure I am, Chamier, Salmasius, Blondel, Ludovicus Capellus, Moyses Amiralus, and many others are against it. The whole Tribe of the *Belgic Remonstrants* (keen Parity Men) are against it, in their Confession of Faith. And I hope G. R. needs not be told, how little Interest such Elders had in the Protestant Consistories of France. Mr. Baxter in his Preface to his *Five Disputations of Church Government* (s), says expressly, that as far as he could understand, the greater part, if not Three for One of the English (Presbyterian) Ministers, were as far against Lay-Elders as any Prelatist of them all. He Confesses himself to be one, and he cites Mr. Vines for another. But I must forbear Excursions, for all my Design at present, is to attend G. R. and make brief Observes on his Proofs he has adduced for the Establishment of the Worshipful Order.

§ VIII.

AND in the first place, G. R. and I are not like to agree about Blondel. G. R. refers me to his Book, *De Jure Plebis in Regimine Ecclesiastico*, as wherein the Order of Ruling Elders is established. I refer G. R. back again to that very same Book, as wherein the Order is fully and industriously overthrown. Blondel appears in it with all his Might for the Interest of the Whole People, the *Universa Plebs*: With what Success as to the Cyprianic Age has been already considered: But he applies himself downright to disprove the Divine Institution of the Order of Ruling Elders. His main Scope obliged him to it. For if the *Plebs Universa*, all and every one of the People, have, by Divine Right, such an Interest in the Government of the Church, as he pleads for; how had it been accountable, that likewise by Divine Right there should have been a certain Order of Men set apart to Represent the People? Sensible of this, I say, Blondel says plainly,

plainly, He finds no mention made of other Elders, besides Pastors, meddling in Church Government, before Constantine's Time: And then he does not at all allow to be of the Clergy (r). He maintains zealously, fully, and solidly, that that Text, 1 Tim. 5. 17. doth not at all make for such an Order (u). And he laughs heartily at *Gerſon Bucer*, for ſo voluminouſly maintaining ſuch an Unfounded Order (v). So happy has G. R. been at citing Patrons for his Order of Ruling Elders.

facta eſt. — Seniores ſuos habuit à Clero Diſverſos qui fidelis plebis nomine regiminiſ, quaſcunque partes ſuo Ordine ac Modo attingerent. p. 27. of *Ediſ. Amſtedami Anno 1677.* & rursus p. 313. plura huc ſcientia videre eſt.

(u) p. 306, 307, 308, 309.

(v) Ad ravim uſque vir pius — Bucerus inclamet — ſed ipſe ſe non modo falſa ſed & compugnantia loqui ſentiat. &c. p. 308.

(r) Sub Conſtantino — Nova rerum facies apparuit; Non tamen fraternitatis conditio deterior

BUT, at leaſt I might have had ſome Regard to Archiſhop *Whiſt*. § IX.

giſt, a Zealous Pleader for Prelacy, who grants, that in the Primitive Church, they had in every Church Seniors, to whom the Government of the Church was committed, &c. (w). But 1. Why ſhould I have more Regard to him concerning Ruling Elders, than G. R. to *Blondel*, *Salmaſius*, and 20 more of his ableſt Friends, concerning Ruling Elders? concerning Conſtant Moderators? concerning *Episcopacy's* being the Government of the Church in St. Cyprian's time? concerning I cannot tell how many more things about which he diſſents from them? 2. Wherein have I ſhewn any diſreſpect to *Whiſt* in this matter? Hath he any where affirmed, that there was ſuch an Order of Divine Right; or in St. Cyprian's Time or Writings? 3. What though he has the Words cited by G. R. as I grant he has them (x)? Is it not evident as Light to any who reads the whole *Traſtate* wherein he has them, that he had no other Ground for ſaying ſo, but the Teſtimony of the *Pſendo Ambroſe*, in his Commentary on 1 Tim. 5. 1. not 17. So that had it not been for that Teſtimony, we had never had ſuch Words from him, and by Conſequence, that his Words ought to be deem'd of no greater Weight, than the Teſtimony whereon they are founded? But this is not all, for 4. G. R. ſhall never make it appear, that *Whiſt* acknowledged an Order of ſuch Elders of Divine Inſtitution, or Catholic Acception. *Whiſt* moſt punctually and minutely deprives the Order of all Shadow

(w) Defence of the Answer to the Admonition. *Traſt.* 17. Cap. 2. Diſviſ. 7 p. 638. Edit. Lond. An. 1574.

(x) Ibid.

of Subsistence in any of the *Texts* of Scripture adduced for it by the Authors of the *Admonition*; and he does it over and over (1). But what needs more? Take his own Words concerning the Worshipful Order. *Pastors be necessary in the Church of Christ*——so be not *Seniors*. The Office of a Pastor is not only described in the Scriptures, but commanded also: Shew where the Office of your Seniors is so (2). You should have proved, that the Office of your Seniors is commanded, which I utterly deny (a). I deny that this Office of Seniors is commanded any where in the New Testament (b). You take that as granted which you cannot prove; that is, that the Office of Seniors is an Office, establish'd in the Church, by the Commandment of God, and not to be altered; which I for my part can never grant unto you, except you have more pithy reasons to prove it than any that you have as yet utter'd (c). Would you have more? he says he has not read this word [Presbyter] (a word so much insisted on by Cartwright, as signifying his Ruling Elder) in any ancient History or Father, commonly taken in any other Signification than that of a Priest (d). And whereas Cartwright had reasoned thus for Ruling Elders. We have not only the Examples of all the Primitive Churches (which ought to move us if there were no Commandment) but we have also a straight Commandment: I say the only examples ought to move us; for what can we (safely) follow than the common High way, beaten and trodden by the Steps of the Apostles and of all the Churches? Whitgift answers, Examples of Churches there may be some, but not of your kind of Seniors: Precept and Commandment for this kind of Government, there is not one in the whole Scripture, or any other approv'd Authority (e). Indeed, his Design in that whole 17th Treatise, is intirely against the Order. All along he maintains, that there is no Divine Institution of such Seniors: That they are not Necessary: Nay, that they are not Tolerable in a Christian Monarchy. Such an Advocate was Archbishop Whitgift for Ruling Elders.

§ X.

BEFORE I proceed, let me give one serious Advice to G. R. (and the rest of his Brethren, Advocates for Presbytery, at this time in Scotland, may advert to it too if they please) It is, that unless he is willing to be abused, and to abuse others, he would not too rashly trust every Author of his Party, nor thus take accounts of the Sentiments of learned Men from every friendly Hand. The Provincial Assemblies of London, in their *Vindication of Presbyterial Government* (he sees) have

no.

notoriously abused him in the Instance of *Whitgift*. And not only so, but in Authorities of greater Consequence, as shall be shown by and by. And who can tell, but he might have been as much abused by the Authors of the *7m Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*, who were likewise Sundry Ministers within the City of London, Anno 1647. if he had chanced to turn up their Book? This is certain, whoso trusts them shall be notoriously abused, not only by their Citations from St. Cyprian for Ruling Elders, wherein they are perfectly Ridiculous (f), (j) p. 171. and little better in any of the rest, from the Ancients: But also in the Instance of the Learned Mr. *Thorndike*, whom they confidently cite (as the Provincial Synod did *Whitgift*) as an Advocate for them, at least an Assertor of them (g). Now (g) p. 174. would my Reader know with what Reason? Let him take it in Mr. *Thorndike*'s own words, in his Learned Discourse of the Right of the Church in a Christian State (h). I shall give (h) p. 127, 128. them largely because they are very pleasant. I know many Church writers (says he) are quoted to prove Lay Elders: For Edit. Lond. 1649. that is also grown a point of Learning, to load the Margent with Texts of Scripture, and Allegations of Authors, in hope no Man will take the pains to compare them, because, if he do, he shall easily find them nothing to the purpose. For instance, my self have the honour to be alledged for one that approves Lay-Elders, even in that place of that very Discourse, where I answer the best Arguments that ever I heard made for them; only because I said then, as now, that we are not bound to think, that all Presbyters preached during the Apostles times. What reason then can any Reader have to presume, that any of their dead Witnesses make more for their purpose, than I who am alive, and stand to see my self alledged point blank against the Position which I intended to prove, because, forsooth, in their Understanding, the Premises which I use, stand not with the Conclusion which I intended to prove? But to speak plain English for the future, if any Man can shew, by any Writing of any Christian, from the Apostles, to this Innovation, any Man indowed with the Power of the Keys that was not also qualified to preach and to celebrate the Eucharist, I am content to be of the Presbyteries the next Morning: though I am somewhat satisfied, that it will never be shewed that I say confidently, it will always be to morrow. Having given this advice to G. R. which might have been more largely insisted on, and back'd
by

A Vindication of a Discourse Entitled,

by divers other Instances of the Authors of his Party; return we now to attend him.

§ XI.

His next Work is, to prove by famous Witnesses, that there were *Ruling Elders* in the Church, *before, after, and in St. Cyprian's time*: And, *maybe* (he says) *on second thoughts, when I consider their Testimonies, I may abate a little of my Confidence.*

(1) § 15. p. 19

(1). Let us try them. His Witnesses before St. Cyprian are *Origen* and *Tertullian*. But why *Origen* before *Tertullian*? Nay, why before *St. Cyprian*? I thought *St. Cyprian* and *Origen* might have been called *Contemporaries*. *St. Cyprian* was Six Years a Bishop before *Origen* died. *Origen* died only Four Years before *St. Cyprian*. The One Anno 254, the Other 258. But let us hear *Origen's* Deposition, even as *G. R.* has set it down. *ἐπιτιμῶν τεταπύχοι*. There are some appointed, who do enquire into the Life and Manners of them who are admitted, that they may debar from the Congregation, such as commit vile things, and receive such as abstain from these; and make them daily better. Had the Provincial Assembly of London (k) in their *Vindication of Presbyterian Government*, given the Testimony fuller, *G. R.* perhaps had done so too: But what has it to do with *Ruling Elders*? no more than *Gen. i. i.*

(k) p. 45.

The Matter, in short, is this: *Celsus* had objected against the Christians, that they used indiscriminately to admit all, even the naughtiest to their Communion: And in answer to this notorious Calumny; *Origen* asserts, that no Discipline was purer or severer than the Christian: That the Governours of the Church were punctually careful to admit no Licentious Person to the Privileges of it: That they were sure forthwith to deprive of those Privileges, *i. e.* to excommunicate all such as after their Admission by Baptism turn'd Profligate and Wicked: And never grant them Readmission, but after good Evidences, of an hearty Reformation manifested in a long Tract of Penitential Satisfactions. So that, nothing plainer, than that 'tis from the whole Series of his Discourse, that those *τεταπύχοι* were such Church-Officers as had the Power of the Keys, and could administer Sacraments, excommunicate the Scandalous, Impose Pennances, and Absolve Penitents. The whole Passage, as 'tis in the Original, is too long to be transcribed. *G. A.* may see it *Contra Cels.* Lib. 3. p. 142. Edit. Cantabrig. An. 1658. The Library of the College of Edinburgh can afford the Book.

TER.

TERTULLIAN is his other *Ante-Cyprianic* Witness; § XII. And his Testimony is, *Apol. Cap. 39.* (not 3. as G. R. has it) the words, *Præsident probati quique seniores honorem istum non Pretio sed Testimonio adepti* (i. e. those who preside in the Christian Assemblies, are approved Seniors, who have got that Honour, not by Money but by Testimony) so many as are of them, are right enough. Thanks be to the aforementioned *Provincial Assembly of London* for it. For in another Book of his (1). G. R. has it scandalously wrong. *Tertullian Apol. cap. 39* (says he) *saieth of the Seniores that preside in their Assemblies, that is the Ministers,* [Approbantur Suffragiis eorum quos regere debent] No such Words in all the Chapter, in all *Tertullian's Apologetic*; in all *Tertullian's* extant Writings. Besides, if the *Probati Seniores* were the *Ministers* in *Rational Defence of Non-Conformity*, how come they to be Degraded into *Ruling Elders* in *Cyprianic Bishop* examined? But have the Words nothing indeed to do with *Ruling Elders*? No more I say again, than with the *Solemn League*, (and *Tertullian* was no more a *Covenanter* than *Cyprian*) unless *Ruling Elders* have the full Power of the *Keys*, and can teach, exhort, excommunicate, &c. 'Tis plain from the Testimony, as you have it on the Margent (m), that *Tertullian's Seniores* could perform these Acts, or Offices. And doth he not elsewhere (n) most manifestly make his *Præsidentes* Administrators of the Eucharist? To conclude our *Ante-Cyprianic* Evidences, how often do we find both *Tertullian* and *Origen* distributing the Clergy which they believed to be of Divine Institution into the Three Orders of *Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons*? Had G. R. discovered his *R Elders* in any one of those so frequently occurring Distributions

(m) Corpus sumus de Conscientia Religionis & Discipline Unitate & spei foedere. Coimus ad Deum quasi manu facta precationibus ambiamus—Coimus ad literarum divinarum Commemorationem—fidem sanctis vocibus pascimus, spem erigimus, Fiduciam figimus: Disciplinam nihilominus inculcationibus densamus. Ibidem etiam exhortationes castigationes & Censura divina. Nam & judicatur magno cum pondere, ut apud certos de Dei Conspectu; summumque futuri judicii Prejudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit ut à Communicatione Orationis & Conventus & Omnis Sancti Commericii relegatur. PRÆSIDENT Probati quique SENIORES honorem istum non Pretio sed Testimonio adepti; neque enim pretio ulla res Dei constat. Tert. Apol. Cap. 39.

(n) Eucharistiae Sacramentum & in tempore Victus & Omnibus Mandatum à Domino, etiam ante lucanis catibus, nec de aliorum quam PRÆSIDENTIUM manu sumimus. De Corona Cap. 3.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

or Enumerations, he had had something to say: But he might as wisely have sought for *Monks of Melrose* or *Knights of Malta* in the Testimonies adduced by him, as for *R. Elders* of his *Ord*: that is, an Order of Church Officers Superiour to the Order of Deacons, Inferiour to the Order of Priests, instituted by Christ, precisely for Government and Discipline, but without Power to Preach or Administer Sacraments.

§ XIII.

(o) P. 45, 46.

AFTER St. Cyprian's time, G. R. cites divers Authors, *Irenæus, Austin, Gregorius Magnus, Isidorus Hispalensis*. I am not at present to concern my self much about them, because he cites them as being after St. Cyprian, for whose time I am only concern'd, and it being none of my present Designs fully to Discuss the Controversie. Only therefore some few short Hints about this *File of Testimonies*. And 1. it may be observed, that G. R. has them all in so many Words from *Vindication of Presbyterian Government* (o), Two only excepted. 2. That these two are but very sordily treated by G. R. One is a Testimony of *Austin's*, which G. R. says is to be found *contra Cresconium lib. 3. cap. 1.* whereas he ought to have said *contra Cresconium lib. 3. cap. 29.* The other is a Testimony of *Gregory's*, for which G. R. cites neither Book, nor Epistle, nor Page; gives us no Direction how to find it. 3. Nor one of his *Post-Cyprianic Authorities* comes up to *Ruling Elders* as above defined: Nor one of them but is capable of a far more natural Sense, than must needs be forced on them before they can give the least Shadow of Countenance to those *Elders* E. g. 4. How is it imaginable, had there been such an Order in the Church in St. *Irenæus's* time, that he who wrote so many Commentaries on the Books of Holy Scripture, and so many long and elaborate Epistles, and Books, and Discourses, wherein he might have had so many proper Occasions, nay sometimes plain Provocations (as in *Epist. ad Evagrium*,) for instance, to have mention'd them, should yet never have done it, but in one short Sentence in his Commentary on the 2d Verse of the 3d Chapter of *Isaiah's* Prophecies? But then the best of it is, that even there is nothing like them. G. R. should certainly have borrowed the Testimony, (not from the *Synod of London* but) from his good Friend *Paul Bayn*, who delivers it thus, *Ecce nos Senatum habemus: Catum Presbyterorum, sine quorum Consilio nihil agi à quoquam licet, sicut Romani habuerunt Senatum cuius Consilio cuncta gererentur* (p). Though even thus it might have

(o) Diocesan's Tryal, p. 62.

been

been controverted: But as *Jerome* himself has it, no Violence can force it to stand for *R. Elders*. His words are, *Et nos habemus in Ecclesia Senatum nostrum, catum Presbyterorum*, that is, unquestionably, not *R. Elders*, but the *Second Order* of *(q)* *Epist. ad Priests*. Unquestionably I say, for no doubt 'tis the *Evag. & Com-* same *Senate* he talks of here, which he pleads for *else-* ment. on *Tir.* where *(q)*.

WHAT hath been said of *Jerome* may, §. be repeated concerning *Austin*. Nor is there so much as a Shadow of an Argument in all *G. R.* has adduced from him for *Ruling Elders*, unless *G. R.* can make two things appear, viz. that they might have been such as he would have them, and yet none of the *Clergy*, for *Austin* always distinguishes them from the *Clergy*; And that the Word *Seniores* must needs signify his *R. Elders*, and 'tis not possible that it can have another Signification; which to affirm, were indeed to procure to himself no very Laudable Character; for who knows, not that in those times there were *Seniores Plebis* who were not Christians at all, and others who, though Christians, yet were no Church Officers? Nothing more certain (as *Blondel, De Jure Plebis, &c.* could have told *G. R.*) than that there were many *Heteria*, or *Corporations* of Men of all *Trades*, whereof the *Chief* or *Principal* Men were called *Seniores*. And then 6. and particularly, as for the *Purgation of Caelianus and Felix*. *G. R.* might have got more concerning *Seniors* in the *Gesta Purgationis Caeliani & Felicis* themselves, than in *Austin's* Abstract of them. The *Seniores Plebis*, if my Memory fails me not, are five Times mentioned in those *Gesta*. But then the Luck of it is, they are always postpon'd to not only the *Deacons*, but the very *Sub-deacons*, and *Lectors*, nay the very *Fossors*, the *Grave-makers*; contrary to all the Laws of *Heraldry*, had they been an Order of Church Officers *Superiour* to *Deacons*. But what needs more? These same very *Gesta* lay open the whole Mystery: *Victor Grammaticus* comes at last to be examined as a Witness, and to declare what he knew concerning *Silvanus's* being a *Traditor*; and yet *Nundinarius* calls him a *Senior*; though it be certain from the whole *Series* of the *Gesta*, so far as he is mention'd in them, that he was no Ecclesiastic Office-bearer (r). Nay his very being design'd *Grammaticus* is

(r) Zenophilus vir Clar. Consul Victori dixit, ergo sciebas Traditorem (Silvanum) Victor Respondit, Traditor fuit. Nundinarius Diaconus dixit. VOS SENIORES clamabatis exaudi Deus Civem nostrum ille Traditor est. Zenoph. V.C.

Consul Victori dixit, clamasti ergo Populo quod Traditor esset Silvanus. & non deberet fieri Episcopus? Victor dixit, clamavi ego & populus nos enim Civem nostrum petebamus integrum virum. *Gesta Purg. Caelil. & Felicis* Edit. cum Optat. Milevir. Parisis. An. 1631. p. 171.

enough, though there were no more to prove that he was no Church Officer. It is plainly added to his Name for Distinctions sake, and to shew what was his Occupation. To call him *Grammaticus*, was as much as to say, he was *Nulla functione Clericali adstrictus*, as *Austin* says of *Cresconius* the *Grammarians*. *Contra Cresconium. Lib. I. Cap. I.*

§ XV.

BUT I must not stay to discuss things so minutely. Two General Considerations may serve for all. 7. Then, never a Word of *G. R.'s Ruling Elders*, in so much as any one of the innumerable Enumerations of the Orders of Church Officers, in the Monuments of the Primitive Times: No mention of them in any *Council* or *Consistory*, Particular or Diocesan, Provincial, Patriarchal or General: Not a Syllable in any *Imperial Edict*: Not a Scrap about them in any Church Historian: A general Silence of them in all the ancient Commentaries upon all the Books of either Old or New Testament. Frequent mention, however, in most of all those Ancient Monuments, not only of *Bishops*, *Priests* and *Deacons*, but of all other inferiour Orders, *Subdeacons*, *Exorcists*, *Lectors*, *Acolytes*, *Door-keepers*, *Grave-diggers*, &c. How hard has the Fate of *Ruling Elders* been, that they, who by their Institution (as our *Presbyterian Brethren* would have it) should have signified so much every where, should have been mentioned nowhere! But doth not the *Pseudo-Ambrose* mention them? I say, he doth not. I shall give my Reasons for my saying so when *G. R.* shall put me to it. All I am to say now is that which is my next Consideration, *viz.* that making the false Supposition that he mentions them, all the Force of *G. R.'s Post-Cyprianic Authorities* is irrecoverably evacuated by it. For *Hilary* (a *Roman Deacon*, the true Author of those Commentaries on *St. Paul's Epistles*, falsely attributed to *Ambrose* says concerning those *Seniors*) he mentions, that they were quite out of Doors long before he wrote those

Commentaries; as is evident from his Words, as you have them on the Margent (s). But he wrote them while *Damasus* (s) Nam apud omnes quidem gentes honorabilis est senectus. Unde & Synagoga, & postea Ecclesia SENIORES habuit quorum sine Consilio nihil agebatur in Ecclesia. Quod quia Negligentia OBSOLEVERIT. Nescio, &c. in 1 Tim. 5, 1. Nam in v. 17. Omnia habet Senioribus Regentibus repugnantia.

WAL

was Bishop of Rome, if we may take his own word for it (t), that is, before the Year 378. By Consequence, the *Seniores* he speaks of were in Desuetude before St. *Jerom* wrote his Commentaries on *Isaiah*: Long before *Austin* was Bishop of *Hippo*, long before he wrote his Books against *Cresconius*, or any of those Epistles wherein he mentions any *Seniores*. Very much longer yet, even by full Centuries, before either *Gregorius Magnus* or *Isidorus Hispalensis* wrote a Syllable. And so much at present about G. R.'s Post-Cyprianic Witnesses.

(t) In hæc Pauli ad Timotheum verba, 1 Tim. 3. 15 [ut scias quemadmodum oporteat te in domo Dei Conversari, quæ est Ecclesia Dei Vivi, Columna

& firmamentum veritatis] Sic, Hilarius, [Scribo tibi ut scias quomodo Ecclesiam Ordines, quæ est Domus Dei, ut cum totus Mundus Dei Sit, Ecclesia tamen Domus ejus dicatur, cujus HODIE Rector est DAMASUS.]

COME we now to St. Cyprian's Contemporaries. It is § XVI. yet more fully (says G. R.) against this Author's bold Assertion, that even in St. Cyprian's time itself, this Office was in the Church, as witness the Writers of that Age. And then he cites Two: what Two? St. *Basil*, who died not till the Year 378. i. e. 120 Years after St. Cyprian; and *Optatus Milevitanus*, who perhaps out-lived St. *Basil*: This is certainly colligible from his own Writings, that he wrote against *Parmenianus* the Donatist, about the Year 370. whereas St. Cyprian (as hath been said) died *An.* 258. The making these St. Cyprian's Contemporaries did indeed put me to my thinking. Possibly, thought I, G. R. intends sometime to stand for one of our Reformers, one of *John Knox's* Contemporaries. And then I cannot tell how many Consequences I dreaded; but one was so obvious, that I think I may name it: It was, that allowing him once to be one of *Knox's* Contemporaries, the Author of the *Fundamental Charter*, &c. would be ruined for ever: G. R.'s Testimony, as having lived in the Days of the Reformation, would in reason pass for good Evidence of the Church of *Scotland's* being reformed by Men of Presbyterian Principles. But so good Luck would have it, I was cas'd of the trouble of such Reasonings, when I saw G. R.'s *Good Old way defended*. Some body, it seems, had convinced him, that he had published a most *Notorious Blunder*, in calling St. *Basil* and *Optatus* St. Cyprian's Contemporaries; and therefore he thought fit to publish a *Retraction* of it and an *apology* for it. He confesses a *Chronological Mistake*, and

N o n e

says,

say, it was occasioned by an *Over hasty Glance of the Chronological Tables*. Now supposing his Ingenuity were not to be suspected in the matter, yet what a sorry Apology was it for him to lay the blame on an *Over hasty Glance of the Chronological Tables*? However it might have done for School-boys, and such little People as I acknowledge my self to be, who write by no Authority, but meerly from mine own private Inclinations, to say the best I can in the Defence of that which I think a very good Cause, yet I cannot see how it suited with the Honour of a Publick, Stated, Authorized, Proclaim'd *Vindicator* of a *National Kirk*. But I said, supposing his Ingenuity were not to be suspected: Some perhaps may apprehend from this, that there is reason to suspect it. I shall neither say there is nor there is not: But this I cannot forbear to say, that if he had not publish'd this Apology for his Blunder, I should have been strongly provoked to have imputed it to another Cause, viz. to his finding *St. Basil* and *Optatus* immediately subjoin'd to *Origen* and *Tertullian*, by the *Synod of London*, in their *Vindication of Presbyterian Government*. 'Twas this *Synod*, I am confident, that made him blunder about *Origen*, in putting him before *Tertullian*, and imagining that he was not one of *Cyprian's* Contemporaries: And 'tis certain, that he has taken the Testimonies of *Basil* and *Optatus* from that *Vindication*: Might it not then have been very probably concluded, that his having found them so Ranked by that *Synod*, had been the Ground of his Mistake, if he himself had not devolved upon it the *Chronological Tables*? But to leave this.

§ XVII.

WHEN *G. R.* was upon the *Vein of Retracting*, he had done himself no Injury, though he had likewise *Retracted* the bringing of *St. Basil's* Testimony: For he has suffered himself to be exceedingly abused by the *Londoners* in it. *BASIL* (says *G. R.* word for word after them) in *Psal. 33. Quatuor gradus Ministrorum constituit, quod scil. Alii sunt in Ecclesia instar Oculorum, ut Seniores, alii instar lingua, ut Pastores, alii tanquam manus ut Diaconi &c.* (w) May I adventure to turn it into *Scottish*, seeing *G. R.* has not done it? If I may, it runs thus, as I take it. *Basil* on *Psal. 33. reckons Four Degrees or Orders of Ministers, viz. that some are in the Church, as it were Eyes, such as Seniors or R. Elders: Others, as it were Tongues, such as Pastors: Others like Hands, such as Dea-*

(w) § 16. p. 20.

cons,

cons, &c. The fourth Order lurks still in the Belly of &c. The Synod was not at leisure (perhaps was not able) to Midwife it out; and G. R. for a good Reason, found himself obliged to give it as he got it. But after all, it was manfully done, to find even the Three Orders mentioned in St. Basil's words. All I can do, is to set down the Father's own Words, in his own Language, as faithfully as I can transcribe them from Frobenius's Edition of St. Basil's Works, Anno 1551; on my Margent (x), and translate them as I am able: and leave to the Reader to judge whether there be any R. Elders in them. They are on Psal. 33. v. 18. and run to this purpose in Scottish, *As the Saints are the body of Christ, and Members in part; and as God hath set in the Church, some in the Place of Eyes, others of Tongues, others of Hands, and others of Feet; just so, among the Holy Spiritual Powers (the Angels) in Heaven, some are called Eyes, because they have received or are instructed with the Inspection of us. Others are called Ears, because they receive our Prayers. And hence it is that here (in this Verse of this Psalm) He (the Psalmist) calls the Powers which oversee us, and assist our Prayers, Eyes and Ears, &c.* Any Body may now see the Reason why we got nothing but an &c. from both the Synod and G. R. for the Fourth Order of Ministers: For it was a little puzzling to fall on the Order that might answer to the Feet: If I were sure G. R. would compound the matter with me, I could find them out: I think our Scottish Bishops nowadays might be the Men, for believe G. R. and his Brethren, and they are the most despicable Ministers of the Nation. But in good earnest, and in the name of common Sense and Christian Ingenuity, can it be innocent thus to abuse the simple People, by giving them to believe, that the venerable Fathers of the Primitive Church give Testimony to such things as never entered their Hearts nor their Heads? what can be more certain, than that St. Basil's aim was to shew God's care over his Church, in appointing his holy Angels to oversee Christians and give them such and such Assistances? And that it was not so much as in his Thought to give any account of any visible Church Officers? Sure I am, Transubstantiation and Purgatory have as much Foundation in his Words as Ruling Elders. This may be another warning to G. R. to beware of taking things at second hand from every

every body: At least it may be a warning to others not to trust too much to *G. R.*'s Citations.

§ XVIII.

(1) § 16. p. 21.

(2) Rescriptum venit ut si Mensurius Felicem Diaconum non reddidisset, ad Palatium dirigeretur; conventus non leves patiebatur angustias. Erant enim Ecclesie ex Auro & Argento quamplurima Ornamenta, quae nec fodere terrae, nec secum portare poterat. Quasi

fideliſſimis

NIORIBUS commendavit, commemoratorio facto quod cuidam anicula dedisse dicitur; ita ut si ipse non rediret, reddita pace Christianis, annicula illa illi daret, quem in Episcopali Cathedra sedentem inveniret. Optat. Mil. ad Parmen. Lib. 1. Fol. 8. Edit. Parisiis. An. 1569.

(a) — Suffragio totius populi Cæcilianus eligitur. Episcopus nempe Carthaginiensis. — Brevis Auri & Argenti sedenti Cæciliano, sicut delegatum à Menturio fuerat, traditur, adhibitis testibus. Convocantur supra memorati Seniores, qui faucibus avaritiæ commendatam ebiberant prædam. Cum reddere cogerentur, subdixerunt communioni plebem. Ibid.

(b) Vindication of Presb. Government. p. 45, 46.

OPTATUS does *G. R.* as little Service as *St. Basil*. 'Tis true indeed, he calls those to whom *Mensurius*, when he was obliged to go to the *Palatium*, the Emperor's Court, committed the sacred *Ustensils*, *Seniores*, Elders. *G. R.* words it for his own Advantage, saying, he committed them to the *Custody of the Faithful Elders of the Church* (y). There's not a word of the *Church* in *Optatus*: nor doth he call them *Faithful Elders*, but rather most *Unfaithful*. His words are on the Margent (z), and their true meaning is obviously no more, than that he committed them to *Seniors*, *deeming them Faithful*, or as if they had been *Faithful*. And that *Mensurius* was deceived in the matter, that they were most *Unfaithful*, is certain, if we may believe *Optatus* in that very same Page: For he says, when Peace was restored to the Church, and another Bishop was constituted, and the *Inventory* of the *Ustensils* given to him, according to *Mensurius's* Order, those *Seniors* were called to an account, but made none; having glutted their own Avarice with the consecrated Ornaments: And when they were like to be forced to account for them, they added the Sin of *Schism* to the Sin of *Sacrilege*, carrying of the People from the Bishop's Communion (a). This I have only taken notice of by the way, that the Reader may see how inaccurate *G. R.* is in his accounts. But why should he have been more accurate than his Masters, the *Provincial Synod of London*, from whom he had this Testimony of *Optatus*, with the rest (b)?

But

But doth not *Optatus's* Testimony amount to a good Proof, § XIX.

that in *Mensurius's* days there were *Ruling Elders*? It amounts to no such thing. What? shall we still have an Order of Church Officers of Divine Institution, Superiour to Deacons, Inferiour to Priests, or Pastors, Invested with the Power of Government and Discipline, but none of the Sacraments wherever we find the word *Seniores*? and what more have we but the bare Word in *Optatus*? what reasoning is this? for my part, *Mensurius's* committing the Inventory to the Custody of an Old woman, to be kept by her, and delivered to his Successor, if he should not return, seems to me a considerable Argument, that those *Seniors* were no Church Officers: For I believe G. R. shall not find it easie to reconcile it with the Principles or Customs of those times. that a Bishop should have appointed Male-Laicks as Checks over such as were in Holy Orders; and it is certain, that in those times all Church Officers, even Subdeacons and Lectors, &c. were ordain'd by the Imposition of the Hand. How incredible then must it be, that *Mensurius* would have made a Little Old woman a Check over *Ruling Elders*, who by the Presbyterian Principles are such Eminent Officers of the Church, above Deacons themselves? But besides this, we have a plain Demonstration, that *Optatus* by his *Seniores* did not mean G. R.'s *Ruling Elders*. We have him more than once reckoning up all the Orders of the Church, but always so, as that you shall not find a *Ruling Elder* among them. Thus *Lib. 1.* Telling how many had lapsed in the Days of the Dreadful Persecution set on foot by the Emperour *Dioclesian*, he distributes all Christians into Five Ranks. 1. The Laicks, who were underprop'd by no (Ecclesiastical) Dignity as he words it. 2. The *Ministri*, the Under-Officers, Subdeacons, Acolyths, Door keepers, &c. 3. The Deacons in the Third, and 4. the Presbyters in the Second Priesthood, and then, 5. The *Tops* and *Princes* of all the Bishops. (c). Now let G. R. try his skill, and let us see to which of these Five Ranks he can reduce his *Ruling Elders*, will he

(c) Quid commemorem Laicos qui tunc in

Ecclesia nulla fuerant dignitate Suffulti? Quid Ministros plurimos? Quid Diaconos in TERTIO? Quid Presbyteros in SECUNDO SACERDOTIO constitutos? Ipsi Apices & Principes omnium aliqui Episcopi, illis temporibus, ut damno æternæ vitæ, istius incertæ lucis moras brevissimas compararent Instrumenta divinæ legis impie tradiderunt. Fol. 6.

find

find them among the *Laicks*? these were in *Ecclesia nulla dignitate suffulti*. They had no Ecclesiastical Dignity. He cannot seek for them among the *Ministri*: will he seek for the Governours among the Servants of the Church? among those who had no Interest in the Government? As little can he expect to find them among the *Deacons*. 'Twere still a Diminution of their Dignity to seek for them there. Nor shall he find them among *Opiatus's* Presbyters, for all these were *Priests*: they were in *Secundo Sacerdotio constituti*. But if they can be found in none of these *Classes*, I think it may prove lost Labour to seek for them at all in *Opiatus*, for G. R. himself I suppose will scarcely take the Courage to seek for them among the *Apices* and *Principes omnium*, the Bishops. *Opiatus*, Lib. 2. has the same Enumeration of Degrees over again. *The Church* (says he) *has distinct Members, Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Servants, and the Croud of the Faithful*.

(d) Certa Membra sua habet Ecclesia, Episcopos, Presbyteros, Diaconos, Ministros, & turbam Fidelium. Dicite cui generi hominum in Ecclesia nostra hoc possit ascribi quod obijcere voluisti? Specialiter nomina aliquem Ministrum: Ostende aliquem Diaconum nomine suo. Indica hoc ab aliquo factum esse Presbytero.

(d). G. R. will have the same Difficulty to find them here as in the preceeding *Muster*. Again, in that same *Second Book*, he has another Distribution, somewhat varying indeed from the former Two; but every whit as unserviceable to G. R. *There are in the Church Four Ranks of People, Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, and the Faithful* (c). *Opiatus* as I take it, here, reckons up Three Orders, as of Divine, or (which is all one) Apostolic Institution: Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons. It is evident from what hath been said, that *Ruling Elders* were not ranked by *Opiatus* in any of these Three Orders. And if G. R. will seek for them among the *Faithful*, (to which Rank, here, the *Ministri* seem to belong, as being only of Human and Prudential Establishment) let him be doing. If he finds them, he shall find them both inferiour to Deacons, and without divine Appointment. Once more in that same *Second Book*, *Opiatus* addresses thus to the *Donatists*. *You have found Boys, you have made them Penitents; and have thereby disabled them for ever for being received into Holy Orders. Confess that you have ruined Souls. You have*

P oba hoc Episcopum admisisse. Lib. 2. Fol. 21.

(c) Extenditis enim manum & super omne caput Mortifera Velamina prætendistis: ut eum sint (sicut supra dixi) Quatuor genera Capitum in Ecclesia, Episcoporum, Presbyterorum, Diaconorum & Fidelium: nec uni parcere voluistis: evertistis animas hominum. Lib. 2. Fol. 26.

found

found ancient Believers, you have (done with them as you did with the *Pœri*) reduced them to the state of Penitents. Confess that you have ruined Souls. You have found Deacons, Presbyters and Bishops, and you have made them Laicks. Confess that you have ruined Souls (f). No room here neither for G. R.'s *Ruling Elders*, as is plain from what hath been said, unless among the Laicks, and then what hath been said recurs too: They are in *Ecclesia nulla dignitate suffulti*: They are not Church-Governours.

(f) Invenistis Pueros: de Pœnitentia Sauciastis, ne aliqui ordinari potuissent. Agnoscite

te vos animas evertisse. Invenistis Fideles antiquos, fecistis Pœnitentes. Agnoscite vos animas evertisse. Invenistis Diaconos, Presbyteros, Episcopos: fecistis Laicos Agnoscite vos animas evertisse. Ibid. & Fol. 27.

BY this time the Reader may judge what all the Huff and Confidence wherewith G. R. introduced himself to this Controversie has amounted to. Well! but I have acted only *Defensively*; endeavoured to evacuate his Evidences for *Ruling Elders*, but have brought none against them. This Rub is soon removed; for if it is an unfounded Order, it is not necessary it should be at all. Besides, as I have already intimated, it was not my design fully to discuss this Controversie. It is not necessary I should, in pursuance of the main Design of my Book; which is, to shew that there was real and proper Prelacy in the Church in St. Cyprian's time: Now 'tis plain this might have been, though there had been *Ruling Elders*. However, that I may shew, it had been no hard Task to have acted *Offensively* too, I am content to give an Argument or Two *ad Hominem*, as they call them. And

I. WHEN I was shewing that I did not think my self obliged to maintain, that a Bishop has the *Sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction*. I did distinguish between a Power without or against which no other Powers can act, though they may, in Conjunction with it, or Subordination to it; and a Power destroying all other Powers, or disabling them from acting (g). This Distinction G. R. encounters thus. If Presbyters cannot act (says he) except the Bishop please, and if they must follow his Light, whatever be their own. I see not what Power they have (h); that is,

(g) Prin. Cyp. Age. p. 2.

(h) Cyp. B. Exam. § 7. p. 7.

plainly, if a Bishop has a Negative over them, Presbyters have no Power at all. Now, the same G. R. in the same Book, tells, that 'tis *Probable enough* [i. e. at least he will not deny) *that for Acts of ruling in the Church, the Ruling Elders could do nothing without him who was their Præses in their Meetings* (the Pastor) *except, may be, in some extraordinary Cases* (i). And in another Place, *We* (Presbyterians) *always maintain'd* [says he) *that a Bishop, considered as a Parish Minister, has Authority over the Ruling Elders* (k). Now, what Authority can he have over them *lesser* than a *Negative*? What Authority can he have over them, if ordinarily they can act whether he will or not? 'Tis plain then, that at least, in all *Ordinary Cases*, the Pastor, by G. R.'s Principles, has a *Negative* over the *Ruling Elders*. But if he has a *Negative* over them in all *Ordinary Cases*, then, in all *Ordinary Cases*, he has a *Power without, or against which they cannot act*. And so it must needs follow, by the same G. R.'s Principles, that *Ruling Elders* cannot be *Ordinary Church-Governours*: Nay, *may be*, no not *Extraordinary Church-Governours*: For 'tis no more but *may be* they can act without the Pastor in *Cases Extraordinary*: And that which is only in the State of *May be*, may not be. But it is enough if they are not *Ordinary Church-Governours*: And that they are not, is demonstrable from the Principles laid down. For, they cannot be *Ordinary Church-Governours*, they cannot be *Church-Governours* at all, if they have *no Power*; no more than a *Body* can be without *Extension*, or a *Rational Soul* without the *Capacity of Thinking*. But according to the Principles laid down, they can have *no Power*: For thus the *Demonstration* runs. *If R. Elders cannot act except the Pastor please, and if they must follow his Light, whatever be their own; I see not what Power they have, i. e. they have no Power*: And if they have *no Power*, they are *no Church-Governours, q. e. d.* This I confess is purely *ad Hominem*, I am curious to see how G. R. will *avoid* the *Force* of it, without *voiding* the *Force* of his own *Reasoning* against my *Distinction*. Again,

§ XXII.

(l) § 12. p. 15.

(m) § 36 p. 49.

2. G. R. in one place approves (l), and in another (m) adopts and makes use of *Blondel's Argument* taken from the *Dichotomy* of the *Clergy* into *Rulers* and *Deacons*: But, generally, *Blondel's Proofs* he brings for this *Dichotomy*, do exclude

clude *Ruling Elders* from being comprehended under either Member of it. G. R. himself will not allow them to be sought for among the Deacons. *Blondel's Proofs* will as little allow them to be sought for among the *Præpositi*, the Rulers. For these they generally make *Priests*, that is, such as can administer Sacraments; which *R. Elders* neither are, nor can be pretended to be. For Instances, let G. R. or any Man turn to *Blondel's Apology for the Opinion of Jerom*, and he will find, that the *Dichotomy* runs between *Priests* and *Deacons*, either in the same, or Equivalent Terms, in the Testimonies of St. *Jerom* himself (n), *Clemens Romanus* (o), *Polycarp* (p), *Justin Martyr* (q), *Clemens Alex.* (r), *Origen* (s), *Cyprian* (t), *Pontius* (u), *Hilarius Pictav.* (v), *Hilarius Diaconus* (w), *The Author of the Questions on the Old and New Test.* (x), *Basil* (y), *Greg. Nazianz.* (z), *Chrysostom* (a), *Pelagius* (b), *Salvianus* (c), *Primasius* (d), *Gildas* (e), *Isidorus Hispal.* (f), *Amarinus* (g), *Rabanus Maurus* (h). But what needs more? The main Purpose of the Argument taken from the *Dichotomy* sends *R. Elders* packing. The very Design of it is to make all those who are comprehended in that Member of that *Dichotomy* which stands in Opposition to Deacons, to make them all, I say, of *One Order*, to leave no such Distinction between Bishops and Presbyters as may range them into Two different Orders. Now no Man ever said, G. R. himself will not say, that his *Ruling Elders* are of the same Order with *Pastors*. But if they are not, what can be more evident, than that they are quite excluded from being Church-Officers by the Argument taken from the *Dichotomy*? *Blondel* himself seems to have been Sensible, that this Consequence did unavoidably result from his Argument: For, in all his large Apology for the Opinion of St. *Jerom*, he never so much as once attempts to establish the Order of *Ruling Elders*; and in his Dissertation *De Jure Plebis*, &c. he manifestly rejects it, as hath been already shewn. In short, G. R. must have One of Two Faculties; he must either be regardless of Contradictions, or he must be able to reconcile them; or else he must part with *Ruling Elders*, having espous'd the Argument taken from the *Dichotomy*. No Reason form'd after the common Standard can entertain both. Thus I have given Two Arguments against *R. Elders*, *ad Hominem*: (the latter *ad Rem* too, when seriously considered; if I mistake it not.)

- (n) Apol. pro Sent. Hieron. p. 4, 7, 8.
- (o) p. 10.
- (p) p. 16.
- (q) p. 22.
- (r) p. 36.
- (s) p. 39.
- (t) p. 43.
- (u) p. 45.
- (v) p. 47.
- (w) p. 57.
- (x) p. 60.
- (y) p. 63.
- (z) p. 64.
- (a) p. 66.
- (b) p. 67.
- (c) p. 70, 71.
- (d) p. 72.
- (e) p. 72.
- (f) p. 73, 74.
- (g) p. 81.
- (h) p. 83.

Let me give other Two *ad Homines* (for now I take in T. F. his Brother *Principal*, in his admirable Book lately published, entitled, *The Hierarchical Bishops Claim, &c.* to bear G. R. Company) and I have done.

§ XXIII.

(i) § 51 p. 75.

(k) p. 104.

3. THEN, G. R. has frankly acknowledged (*i. e.* he has said, *He will not contest it with me*, which I take to be a very frank Acknowledgment from G. R.) that all Church Power of Government and Discipline is founded on the Power of the Sacraments (*i*). T. F. in his *Review of Dr. Scot's Pleadings*, says in express Terms, that *He holds the GOVERNING POWER to be APPENDANT upon, and CONSEQUENT unto the POWER of ORDER in PREACHING and ADMINISTRATING the SEALS of the COVENANT* (*k*). Dare I adventure now to entertain our Two *Principals* with a *Syllogism* or Two? why? what is the Hazard? here, then, they are. 1. None can have the Power of Church-Government and Discipline, but those who have the Power of Preaching or Administ'rating the Sacraments. But Ruling Elders have not the Power of Preaching or Administ'rating Sacraments. *Ergo*, they can have no Power of Church-Government and Discipline. 2. Those who have no Power of Church-Government and Discipline, are no Church-Governours: But Ruling Elders have no Power of Church-Government and Discipline. *Ergo* they are no Church-Governours. This Reasoning, I dread, may be found *ad Rem* too, as well as *ad Homines*. I mean, that this Proposition, that the Power of Church-Government and Discipline is founded on the Power of the Sacraments; stands upon surer Foundations than the Concessions or Assertions of either G. R. or T. F. In the mean time I proceed.

§ XXIV.

(l) p. 97. &c.

(m) p. ult.]

4. G. R. in his fam'd *Animadversions* on Dr. Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*, was not at greater pains to prove any thing, than that the POWERS of Teaching and Ruling are *Inseparable* (*l*). 'Tis true, in his *True Representation of Presbyterian Government*, the Circumstances of Affairs so requiring, he found himself obliged to qualify that Principle a little; and to maintain the *Separability* of the Teaching and the Ruling Powers in Cases of *Necessity*, in *Critical Interims*, in *Turbato Statu Ecclesie*; as he there words it (*m*). I can give him this too, for it does no hurt to my Argument, as we shall hear by and by. T. F. is as earnest for the aforesaid *Inseparability* as G. R.

is. We have had him already declaring the *Governing Power* to be *Appendent upon*, and *Consequent unto* the *Power of Order*. He had said the same thing before (n), *The Preaching of the Word* (n) p. 8. and *Administration of the Sacraments, together with the APPENDANT Power of Discipline and Government*—— Again, in that same *Review of D. Scott's Pleadings*, our Lord (says he) divided them not, viz. the *Doctrinal* and *Jurisdictional Keys*, neither were the *Apostles* to divide them—— therefore, since the Doctor acknowledges, that the *Apostles*, by *Virtue of our Lord's Commission*, devolved upon *Pastors* the *Doctrinal Authority*; and committed to them that *Key*; why not, I pray, the *Jurisdictional* also, both being **INSEPARABLY** tied together (o)? And a little after, he positively affirms, that both *Keys* are in their nature **INSEPARABLY** connected (p). (o) p. 102. (p) p. 103. He has the same Notion over again in his *Review of D. Monr's Pleadings* I mean, he makes the *Jurisdictional Power* an *Appendage of the Power of Preaching* the Gospel, and *Administering Sacraments* (q). Both Authors do likewise, in most express Terms, deny all *Power of Preaching* to *Ruling Elders*. They have *No Dogmatick Power* that is proper to *Pastors* says T. F. (r) But what need of Consequences where we have plain and positive Assertions? We hold, says he, that the *Scripture* points out an **ELDER or PRESBYTER** that **RULES ONLY**, and is *inferiour to the Labourer in the Word and Doctrine*, as having **NO INTEREST** therein (s). (r) p. 2. (s) Ibid. G. R. says the same thing: *Ruling Elders have no Authority to preach* (t). *There were Ruling Elders who were not Preachers* (u). (t) Cyp. B. There might be a *Plurality of Presbyters* in a particular Congregation; not only *Presbyters* that were **ONLY RULING**, but **PREACHERS** also (v). *The Ruling Elders who were no Preachers*—— (w). These two Propositions then are clear, (u) Ibid. § 15. (v) § 24. p. 29. (w) § 48. p. 70.

See also *Good Old Way defended*, p. 23. Where G. R. thus. They who are sent to Teach and Baptize Authoritatively in the Name of Christ, and have Power to command and require People (by Vertue of their Commission from Christ) to obey what they enjoyn them, have also Power of Spiritual Correction of them who do not obey his Laws: For we do not read that Christ committed to some the **ONE OF THESE POWERS**, and the **OTHER** to **OTHERS**.

1. That

A Vindication of a Discourse Entitled,

1. That the Power of Preaching and Administ'rating Sacraments, and the Power of Government and Discipline are inseparable. 2. That Ruling Elders have not the Power of Preaching and Administ'rating Sacraments. I dare not adventure on more *Syllogisms*: But I may ask a Question, or Two. I ask then, seeing the Powers of Preaching and Governing are *Inseparable*, how can Ruling Elders have the *Later*, when it is confessed, they have not the *Former*? Where Two Powers are in *their Nature inseparably connected*, how can One be where Both are not? Where One Power is *Appendent upon*, and *Consequent unto* another, how can it (*Exist*, shall I say, or) *Subsist*, without that *Other* to which it is *Appendent*, and on which it is *Consequent*? Nay, say that those Powers are *Separable* in *Cases of Necessity*, in *Critical Interims*, in *Troubled States* of the Church; and I have still some *Questions*. Have we had nothing but one continued *Case of Necessity*? has all been *Critical Interim*? Has the Church been always in *Statu Turbato*, never a Day, nor an Hour in *Statu Pacato*, ever since our Saviour's Days? And must not the Two mentioned Powers have been in a constant *State of Separation* ever since our Saviour's Days, if there were R. Elders who had the *One* without the *Other*? Is it imaginable, that our Blessed Lord or his Apostles instituted an *Order of Office-bearers* in his Church, who yet could have *no Power* without *perpetual Violence done to Nature*? No Power but such as at best could only be had in *Cases of Singular Necessity*, or *Critical Interims*, or *Troubled States* of the Church? And so much for G. R.'s Tripartite Distinction, which, methinks, by this time is sufficiently discovered to be as unserviceable to him, as any of the preceeding *Subterfuges*.

CHAP. IX.

No Countenance given by the Principles of the Cyprianic Age to the Papacy.

ST. JEROM, I remember, allows no Man to sit silent § I.

Sunder a Suspicion of Heresie (a). G. R. has endeavoured to bring me under the Suspicion of one, and not a little one, even plain Popery. Enquire we therefore, with what Reason. But then when I consider that St. Austin has said in one place, that no Man, unless his own Heart consents to it, is wounded from another Mans Mouth (b). And in another, that it is no wonder that he who endeavours to gather scattered Wheat should suffer Injuries from the Resilient Dust that is about it; or that he who diligently seeks after our Lord's lost Sheep should be torn with the Prickles of Thorny Tongues (c): And in a third, that he who wilfully detracts from ones Reputation, mistakes his Measures, and adds to that ones Reward (d): When I consider that excellent Saying of St. Cyprian's, that not the Reproached, but the Reproacher is the Wretch; that not he who is smitten, but he who smites his Brother is the Sinner in the Eye of the Law; and, he who injures the Innocent is the Injur'd Person (e): When I consider that St. Paul, the great Preacher of the Doctrine of Non resistance was accused of Sedition (f), and all the Apostles, of being Drunk on the Day of Pentecost (g): And all the Primitive Christians, of Atheism; and Eating the Flesh of Harmless Infants; and indulging themselves in all Lewdness and Promiscuous Mixtures:

(a) Nolo in Suspicionem heresios quinquam esse patientem &c. Ep. 61. ad Pamach.

(b) Sic autem unicuique est Os proprium nec quisquam sine consensu Cordis sui, ex Ore vulnerratur alieno.

Cont. Ep. Parmen. L. 2. C. 12.

(c) Quid ergo mirum si cum Grana de area Dominica, excussa, simul cum palea & terra introsum retraham injuriam Resilientis pulveris suffero? vel cum Domini mei oves

perditas diligenter inquirō, spinosarum linguarum vepribus laceror? Contra Lit. Petil. Lib. 3. Cap. 11.

(d) Quisquis volens detrahit famæ meæ, nolens addit Mercedi meæ. Cont. Lit. Petil. Lib. 3. Cap. 7.

(e) Neque enim qui audit Conviciū, sed qui facit miser est. Nec qui à fratre vapulat, sed qui fratrem cædit, in lege peccator est: Et cum nocentes innocentibus injuriam faciunt, illi patiuntur injuriam qui facere se credunt. Ep. 59. p. 134.

(f) Act. 24. 5. (g) Act. 2. 13.

Nay,

Nay, that our Redeemer himself, was not only called a *Glutton and a Wine-bibber, and a Friend to Publicans and Sinners*

(b) *Matt. 11, 19.*

(i) *Joh. 7, 20.*

(k) *Matt. 12, 24.*

(b), but said to have had a Devil (i); and to have cast out Devils by the Prince of Devils (k): When I consider that I am not alone in this matter, but that all Advocates for Episcopacy, and by Consequence, the best Advocates the Protestant Cause has had against Popery, are generally involved with me, in the Suspicion: When I consider these things, I say, I think I have no reason to be angry. And therefore, with the Readers allowance, and without Passion, I will briefly apply my self to these Two things. 1. To do my self Justice. And then, 2. To consider the Grounds of the common Clamour rais'd by our Presbyterian Brethren against the Advocates for Episcopacy, as if they were Friends to the Papacy.

§ II.

1. LET me do my self Justice: an easie Work; and requiring no mighty Applications: But it must be done. First, then, the serviceable Jealousie is started in the very first page of G. R's Preface. *It is unaccountable, says he, that in a Matter that Salvation does so much depend upon, in the Opinion of Prelatists, they should lay so much Stress (as commonly they do) on the Opinions of Men, and the Testimonies of the ancient Church; seeing all, except Papists agree, that Matters of Faith, and which Salvation dependeth upon, must be determined only by Scripture, and that God speaking in his word is the only Judge in such Controversies.* Passing by many things observable in this discourse, you see this plainly in it; that there is no other way to account for the Prelatists making so much of, laying so great Stress upon the Testimonies of the ancient Church, but by making them Papists. Now if this was particularly levelled against me, I shall only ask if even G. R. would not have laugh'd at me, if I had gone about to prove by Texts of Scripture, that such and such were the Principles of the Cyprianic Age with regard to Church Government? If it was levell'd generally, against all Advocates for Episcopacy; then it falls to G. R's Share to maintain, that never Prelatic Advocate attempted to find Episcopacy in the Scriptures: Or, that the Cause of Episcopacy is the worse for having the plain Testimonies of the Ancients to assist Scripture in proving it: Both tasks pretty pleasant

pleasant as I take them. The Jealousie thus started in the Preface is more warmly pursued in the Book. Let us try with what Success.

SECONDLY, then, for proving that there was proper § III. Episcopacy in St. Cyprian's time, I insisted on this for one Argument, That by the Principles of that Age, every Bishop was the Principle of Unity to all the Christians within his District, wherein, for the most part, there were many Presbyters, as at Rome, 46, &c. He was the Head, and all the rest, Presbyters, as well as others, were Members of the Body, &c. (l) All I am now concern'd for is, to purge it of Popery: For G. R. has told his Reader, *That this very Cyp. Age from Argument is fully, with as much Strength, managed by the Papists for the Popes Universal Headship over the Christian Church* (m). And that *the Pope must be the Center of Unity among Bishops is, indeed, the Native Conclusion of the Argument* (n). And again, *indeed this Argument destroyeth the Parity of Bishops which he pleadeth for*. (I pleaded then, for a Parity among Bishops, as G. R. confesses) *as well as Presbyters, and its Native Conclusion is, we must either have the Papacy over the Church, or Anarchy in it* (o). Now, had G. R. shewn, either that there was no such Principle received in St. Cyprian's time; or, that my Inference from it was not necessary (Tasks too hard for him or any Man alive) he had said something to the Purpose: But to make my Argument infer the Papacy, is more than what is most surprizing: Did ever Papist reason at this Rate; every Bishop, in St. Cyprian's time, was the Principle of Unity to his own Church: Ergo the Bishop of Rome, was the Principle of Unity to the Church Catholic? If G. R. knows the Man (for my part, I know him not) he may tell him from me, that he seems not to be nice about Consequences. The Pope's Universal Headship can no more follow from every Bishop's being the Principle of Unity to his own Diocese, than from the Presbyterian Minister of Curry's being the Principle of Unity to the Presbyterian Congregation in that Parish. In short: I did (as I still think) effectually prove, that the Principles of the Cyprianic Age stood in direct opposition to the Pope's Supremacy (p): This G. R. knew very well, and could not deny it (q): No Reason therefore, to think that it was (the *Intentio Operantis*) my Design to establish the Pope's Universal Headship. As

(l) See Prin. Cyp. Age from p. 18. to p. 27.

(m) § 36. p. 31.
(n) § 32. p. 42.

(o) § 35. p. 45.

(p) Prin. Cyp. Age from p. 27 to 32.

(q) § 33. p. 42.

little reason to say, that (the *Intentio Operis*) the Tendency of my Argument made for the Pope; unless G. R. inclines to maintain, that a particular Bishop cannot be the Principle of Unity to a particular Church, unless there be an Universal Bishop to be Principle of Unity to the Church Universal. Now this I take to be a Task too hard for all the *Papists* and *Presbyterians* in *Christendom*.

§ IV.

THIRDLY, another Argument I insisted on, was, that by the Principles then received, whatever the *Jewish High-Priest* was to the *Other Priests* and *Levites*, &c. Every particular *Christian Bishop* was the same to the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, &c. within his own District (r): And having proved this by unanswerable Arguments, I added, that the Names, *Priest*, *Priesthood*, *Altar*, *Sacrifice*, &c. So much in use in those times amounted to a Pregnant Argument, that it was then believed, that the *Christian Hierarchy* in every particular Church was copied from the *Jewish*. Little did I dread to be saluted a *Papist* for such reasoning. But there was no other thing to do the *Job*. I see (says G. R.) the *Learned Author* (I thank him for the Irony) is very unhappy in stumbling upon *Popish Arguments*: And he can say little for his *Bishop* but what they say for their *Pope*: And it is evident, that the *Papists* from this Medium, argue with much more shew of reason &c. (s) and a little after, I cannot but still observe, how much the *Papists* owe him not only for their *Pope*, but for their unbloody *Sacrifice*, &c. (t) And now, without Controversie, I am a *Rank Jesuit*: The *Papists* are in my Debt for both *Pope* and *Mass*: And if I am for the *Popish Mass*, I am for *Transubstantiation*: And he who is for that may be for any thing. But to be short, was it possible that G. R. was in good earnest here? If he was, he should have at least look'd a little better about him, before he had involv'd St. *Cyprian* and all his *Contemporaries* in the same Guilt with me; for I'll take my Oath on't, so far as I am for the *Mass*, they were my *Masters*. Or rather, if their using the Terms, *Priest*, *Altar*, *Sacrifice*, &c. can be made an Argument for the *Popish Mass*, the *Papists* have not me but G. R. to thank for it; For I do sincerely protest, I am not able to make an Argument of it. But I cannot allow my self to think that G. R. was serious in this Charge of *Massing*. I am rather willing to believe, he

dc;

design'd it for *Banter*, and I am content to pass it for such, and not give it the hard name of a *Malicious Suggestion*. Well,

BUT whatever comes of the *Mass*, are not the Papists indebted to me for their *Pope*? My Advice to G. R. is, that he would even acknowledge, that he intended this for *Banter* too, but not against *Me*, but against the *Papists*. For, if I understand any thing of mine own Argument, it smites the *Pope* under the *Fifth Rib*: That is, it shews irrefragably, that by the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*, the Papists cannot draw an Argument from *Aaron* to the *Bishop of Rome*, or any *Universal Bishop* whatsoever. For if, by the Principles of that Age, every particular Bishop was the *same* to his own Church, that *Aaron* was to the *National Church* of the *Jews*, that is, an *High Priest* without any *Visible Superior*, then by those Principles, we have as many *Aarons*, as many *High Priests* acknowledging no *Visible Superior*, as we have particular Bishops of particular Churches: And by unquestionable Consequence, no Room left for *One Aaron* to *High-Priest* it over the Church Catholic. If G. R. would have more to this purpose, he may consult just such another Papist as I am, (as to Principle, I mean,) namely, the admirable Mr. *Dodwell*, in his excellent *Discourse concerning the One Altar and the One Priesthood* (u); where he may find the Popes Pretensions solidly sent packing by this same very Argument. But

FOURTHLY, the next *Stretch* (and the last I shall take notice of at present) G. R. has made to *Force* me into the *Pope's Service*, is, of all, the most wonderful. When I came to consider how every particular Bishop stood related to the Church Catholic, I proceeded by Steps. The first was, that by the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*, all Bishops were *Colleagues*, and made up *One College* (v). A Step, methinks, considering what I have discoursed above (w), the Pope will give me small thanks for: But the Second, as I thought, was yet more directly levelled against him. It was, that as the *One Bishop* was the *Principle of Unity* to a particular Church, so this *College of Bishops* was the *Principle of Unity* to the Catholic Church; And *Jesus Christ* was the *Only Principle of Unity* to the *College of Bishops*. Subjoyning thus to the Person my Letter was directed to, I hope not being a *Romanist*, you will

v.

(u) Cap. 9. § 5, 7, 8, 9.

(v) p. 78.

(w) Vide supra Cap. VI.

§ XVII. &c.

(x) p. 78.

not require that I should prove the highest Step of this Gradation (x). My meaning, I thought was so plain, that no ingenuous Reader could readily mistake it: viz. That the College of Bishops, by the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, had no Visible Superiour. There was no Bishop of Bishops: No Universal Bishop: No Intermedial Step between the College of Bishops, and the Invisible Head of the Church. I used not many words, indeed, but then, I expressed my Mind almost in the very Terms of a very ancient Author, in a Testimony of his, frequently insisted on by Protestant Writers, as being very pat and peremptory against the Pope's Supremacy. A Testimony proposed by Bellarmin himself, as an Objection against the Pope's Supremacy, and which he could not answer, I believe, no not to his own Satisfaction. The Testimony runs to this purpose in Scottish. *The Divine Order of Bishops is the first of those Orders which see God: And it is also the Highest and the Last: For therein is finished and completed the whole Contexture of the Christian Hierarchy. For as we see the whole Hierarchy terminated in Jesus: so every particular one is terminated in its own Divine Bishop.* You have the

(y) Ἡ Θεία
ἐκκλησία
τῶν ἱερέων
πρῶτον
ἀπὸ τοῦ
ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ
τάξεως
ἀνεκτάται
ἢ καὶ ἔσται
αὐτῇ καὶ ὁ
αὐτὸς ἀπο-
κρίσις καὶ ἀπο-
κρίσις πᾶσι
τῶν κατὰ
ἱεραρχίας διακόνων, ὡς καὶ ἅπαντες
ἐκκλησίαν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἱερέων.
De Ecclesia Hierarchica, Cap. 5.

Author's own Words on the Margent (y). And all that Bellarmin says to it, is, that Dionysius (the pretended Arcopagite, for he is the Author) speaks only of the Order, not of the Jurisdiction of Bishops. He has not one word more (z), that is in effect, he says just nothing at all; or rather worse than nothing: For it had been better to have been silent, than to have thought to have warded off the Blow of such a plain Testimony by such a far fetch'd and unapplicable Distinction.

(z) Dico Dionysium loqui de Ordine Episcoporum, non de Jurisdictione. Bellam. De Rom. Pont. Lib. 4. Cap. 25.

§ VII.

THUS was my Plot laid, and never Man securer than I against Suspensions of Popery, upon account of such a Passage in my Book. And I do verily believe I might have escaped, Arrant Papist that I was, had it not fallen to G. R.'s Share to unmask me. Take the surprizing Discovery in his own Words. *Here I observe (says he) the Discourse is about a visible Head,*

or Principle of Unity to the Church, which cannot be ascribed to Christ (and who ascribed it to him?) wherefore this is wholly Impertinent (wholly impertinent to exclude a Pope!) Or if it have any Sense, it tendeth to make his Reader a Romanist, whom he supposeth not to be one already. Why? For if the particular and Catholic Church have a visible Principle of Unity, and that which he maketh to be the Uniting Principle, have nothing that is visible to make them one among themselves; they who can receive his Doctrine about a Principle of Unity, will see a Necessity of a Pope to unite the Bishops, as much as of a Bishop to unite the Presbyters. (All this is so deep, that I confess I cannot see to the bottom of it: But go we on with G. R.) I desire to know of him (adds he, a little after) why he thinks the Romanists will put him to prove the Highest Step of this Gradation, more than Protestants will? (Because it excludes the Pope.) Doth any of them deny Christ to be the Principle of Unity to the Church? (The Principle of Unity immediately next to the College of Bishops, they do all.) They only make the Pope his Vicar in this; (That is what I just now said, they make him a mediate Principle of Unity between Christ and the College of Bishops: And why do they so?) Because they think such an one is needful in the Church who is visibly conversant among Men. (And what if herein they are mistaken?) no they cannot, why?) And doth not our Author suppose the same Necessity of such a visible Head till he come to the College of Bishops? (yes, according to the Principles of the Cyprianic Age.) And he leaveth them Headless, that is without a visible Head: (Just as St. Cyprian and all his Contemporaries did.) Wherefore it may be rationally concluded, that this Doctrine is either Popish or palpably absurd (a). Now if it must needs be one of the Two, even let it be the latter, and so I may be a Protestant still. Consider Reader if thou hast not here profound Speculations. How willing is G. R. to have me reconciled to the Pope! Now charitable Sir, even do me the kindness to reconcile me to the Presbyterians too: You are able, if you please, to make this very Book I am now writing, the happy Instrument of the Peace, when it comes to your Hands. For if you continue of this Vein of Reasoning, whereof we have just now had a Specimen; what can be too hard for you? And so I have done with mine own Purgation:

But

(a) Cyp. B. Exam. § 61. P. 89 90.

A Vindication of a Discourse Entitled,

But not with my Undertaking. Proceed we therefore,

§ VII.

II. TO consider a little the *Grounds* of the *Common Claim*, rais'd by our Presbyterian Brethren against the *Advocates* for *Episcopacy*, as if they were *Friends* generally to the *Papacy*. That there is such a *Bold Calumny* zealously and indoltriously propagated among the *People* by the *Advocates* for *Presbytery*, is so notorious as to need no proof. Never a Book publish'd by them but has it over and over, and very much Stress laid upon it. 'Tis not to be doubted, that 'tis more frequently in their Sermons, and in their private Conferences. I am best acquainted with their printed Books; and so far as I have been able to advert, the *Grounds* of the *Calumny* may be reduced to Two. 1. That the *Prelatic Advocates* make use of *Popish Arguments*, or borrow their *Arguments from the Papists*. 2. That *Episcopacy proves the way to the Papacy*: The same Reason that raises a Bishop over Presbyters, with equal Force tends to raise a Pope over the Bishops. These two Grounds I shall briefly examine, for undeceiving the People.

§ IX.

1. THE *First* is, that the *Prelatic Advocates* borrow their Arguments, for establishing *Episcopacy*, from the *Papists*. This Plea has been insisted on by many: But by none more zealously (and I may add, loathsomly) than our Three now living famous Advocates for *Presbytery*: Mr. *Jameson*, G. R. and Mr. *Forrester*, in their Three late Books, all published within these Three Years; and none more heavily loaded with this mighty Prejudice than the worthy *Doctor Monro*, for writing his excellent *Enquiry into the new Opinions*, &c. *Jameson* is at him with *Tooth and Nail* upon this very Head, in his *Preface* to his *Nazianzenian Querela*, the First of the Three Books mentioned. They (the *Prelatists*, says he) *use to english Romish Sophisms*——as, to name no more, is the constant practice of *A. M. D. D.* And how frequently is he at it in his Book? *The Jesuits are his Masters* (b)——The Protestants for ever Silence and Baffle the Jesuits and their Progeny, *D. M.* and such Companions (c). *D. M.* would patronize *Petavius* the Jesuit against both Protestants and Fathers (d). To see the Reformed conquering, and the Jesuits foil'd, some are much pain'd, and in special *D. M.* (e) *D. M.* follows his Master *Bellarmin*

(b) p. 144.

(c) p. 145.

(d) 154.

(e) 162.

in this wretched Detorsion, &c. (f) Bellarmin herein is fol- (f) p. 178.
 lowed only by some of the more impudent of his Brethren, as (g) p. 179.
 Bayly the Jesuit, and Petavius; and last of all appears their (h) p. 180.
 perpetual Shadow, D. M. (g) Bellarmin objects also, as doth (i) p. 185.
 his Ape D. M. &c. (h) The Jesuits and their Follower D. M. (k) p. 188.
 dream they find a fine distinction, &c. (i) Most dishonest there- (l) p. 197.
 fore is the Conduct of the Loyolites, and of others of the Prela- (m) p. 198.
 tists their Associates in this matter, but above all Men, that of (n) p. 207.
 D. M. (k) Here again we find D. M. at his old Filching Trade, (n) p. 236.
 transcribing Petavius, &c. (l) Nay, what was the Doctor (p) p. 237.
 but a Giddy Papaturient (m)? He proposed Popish Queries (n),
 as is his constant practice, this wretched Paralogism, he borrows
 from a Jesuiste (this is Sheer wit) Cornelius à Lapide (o).
 In a word, the Romishness of all his Cavils is manifest (p). Nay
 Jameson does not leave the Doctor till he Circumcises him and
 makes a Jew of him (q). For whatever Contradictions were (q) p. 237.
 in his Character, it mattered not, if he was black enough.
 This is but a Sample of Jameson's Courtesies to the Doctor.
 Indeed this Author spares no Man: The incomparable
 D. Pearson, sometimes Bishop of Chester, has publish'd Opinions
 much fitter for a Jewish Cabalist, or Romish Traditionary, than a
 Protestant Doctor (r). The admirable Mr. Dodwell (who has (r) p. 121.
 alone written more good Reason against the Pope, than all
 the Scottish Presbyterians, since that day that Mr. Andrew
 Melvin came from the Feet of Theodore B. &c. till this very
 day, have done) is one of the Fiery Zealots, who, some
 time or other, will, no doubt, throw off the Mask, and profess
 himself a Romanist (s). Nay, the Romanists had despair'd long (s) p. 101.
 ere now, in a very material Case, if the two (Pearson and
 Dodwell) had not used prodigious Endeavours to keep them in
 Heart, and gratifie them by reconciling Contradictions, for fixing
 the singular Successors of Peter (t). D. Beverege is even worse (t) p. 220.
 than a Papist, for he has published Falshoods so gross, that even
 the more ingenuous Romanists are asham'd of them (u). Well! (u) p. 212.
 If D. Monro was, and the Author of the Fundamental Char-
 ter is a Papist, as the same Mr. Jameson confidently insinuates
 in his Preface (v), you see they are clubbed with very good (v) p. 67.
 Company: Indeed, not with these Three great Men only,
 but with the whole Body of the Prelatists: For believe this
 Man of Charity; and the whole Party give too evident Signs
 of

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

of their separating from the Body of the reformed Churches, and in too many things, they but too nigh approach the Romanists: Their Government and Hierarchick Scale, is one and the same, save one Roundle, with that of Rome: All their Arguments they bring either from Scripture or Antiquity, are learned from Bel-
 larmin and such Romanists; and admit no less Improvement for the evincing of the Papal Authority, than the Episcopalians have made thereof for the establishing of their Prelatic Power (w). And Twenty times more to this purpose may be found in that brave Book, entituled *Nazianzen's Quærels & Votum Ju-
 stum* (x).

(w) p. 99.

(x) See p. 103.

106. 16. 49.

207. & passim.

§ X.

NEXT, appeared G. R.'s *Good Old Way defended*, written off set purpose against D. Monro: And the very first words of it are, *It hath been observ'd by some who have read this Book* (D. M.'s Enquiry into the new Opinions, &c.) *that the Au-
 thor hath been much beholden to some of the Jesuits and other Pa-
 pists, not only for his Arguments, but even for his Invektives, &c.*
 (y). He (D. M.) seemeth to take the same Liberty to himself of speaking all the ill he can devise of Presbyterians, that the Author of *Pax vobis* doth against Protestants of all Sorts (z). He hath borrowed his account of the Apostolate from the Papiſts: It is not his own (a). Many such Suggestions are in this book (b). But for brevity, I shall only mention one more. D. M. had insisted on this Argument for Episcopacy, That we have the same (if not better) Evidence of its having been the Govern-
 ment of the Church, ever since the Apostles Days, than we have for the Canon of the Scripture. The Argument he press'd home, indeed, and withal very modestly, as any Man may see in his own book (c). Well! How did G. R. answer this Argument? Did he offer to shew that there was either better or other Evidence for the Canon of the Scrip-
 ture, e. g. that the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, or the Epistle of *James*, or St. *Peters* Second, or St. *Johns* Second and Third, or *Judas* Epistle, or the *Apocalypse* belong to the Canon, than their Episcopacy? Nothing like it. Did he deny D. M.'s Inference. Neither was he so hardy as to venture on that. What then did he say? Take it in his own Words. *I have heard* (says he) *that A. M. D. D. hath been jealous'd as in-
 clin'd to Popery, though his accusers fail'd in their Probation.*
 Hi

(y) p. 1.

(z) p. 7.

(a) p. 91.

(b) See p. 10.

11. 92. 149. 152

(c) p. 134,
 235, 136.

He here (and in some other passages of this Book) seemeth to prove what they could not make out: And then he goes on to tell, how Stapleton and many other of the Romish Doctors use the same Argument: And it is observable, that Popery and Prelacy (d) See p. 141, must be defended by the same Arguments. And this is indeed 142, 143. all that's Intelligible in his whole Answer to the Doctor's unanswerable Argument (d).

MORE zealously yet is the Doctor's Popery discovered § XL. by Mr. Forrester, in his Hierarchical Bishop's Claim. He is at him for it in the very Second page of his Preface: The Doctor's Enquiry into the new Opinions, &c. is of *(such a Virulent Tincture and Popish Composure, that the Author might seem rather a Person in some of the Popish Orders, than any bearing the Character of a Protestant Minister.* Indeed this Gentleman's Talent at discovering the Popery of Prelatists is extraordinary (e). But I shall only instance in one Effort more of it, which to me seems somewhat more than wonderful: And were I, G. R. I would burn the *Good Old Way defended*, and resolve never again to publish a Line to the World: For never Man farther out-done by another, than he, by T. F. Would you know wherein, why, T. F. has found D. M. a Rank, Rotten, Reigning Papist, where G. R. was not able to perceive that he was so. D. Mouro shewing that *Matt. 20. 25.* and the parallel Texts do not make for Presbyterian Parity, used this as one Argument, *That our Lord did that himself among his Disciples, which now he commanded them to do to one another, and therefore the doing of it towards one another in obedience to our Saviour's Command, could not infer a Parity, unless it may be blasphemously inferred that Christ and his Apostles were equal* (e). Now G. R. I say, was so blind, as not to discover the Horns of (f) p. 18. the Beast here (g); But T. F. has seen them (and he might have seen the Cloven Foot too, had he had a mind for it) (x) See Good Old Way defended. Sect. in most ample Form. In this Argument of the Doctor's, he has seen stark staring Romanism; and he has seen it too, IV. § 2, 3, 4. most sadly and senselessly brought in and made subservient to the Doctor's purposes. 'Tis but a poor and mean Answer and Reason of the Doctor's: a Notion he is beholden for to his Popish Masters. And after Two or Three mis-cited Latin Verses; There's no doubt that the Doctor has as much Exposed and Baffled his own Judgment and Reputation, in this Thrautonic weak Answer, as in any thing else. ————— It seems the Doctor is so highly

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

highly in Love with this Popish Notion and Evasion, that he has not concern'd himself to take notice, what Baffling Replies Protestant Divines have return'd to it; wherein they have discovered what an Insipid Impertinent Evasion it is, to save the Pope's Mitre from the Stroke of our Lord's Prohibition——I know not if it be true, that this Man rode in the Pope's Guards, but sure I am, he fences fiercely for his Mitre——the Pope's Holiness has a fair Plea from the venerable Doctor——

I dare promise him the Pope's Approbation of his Commentary, &c.

(b) Review
of D. M's
Pleadings p 18
19, 20.

(i) Supra C.
11. § XL.

(k) Cap. IV.
§ XIX. &c.

(b) And this, and such flat *Billingsgate* stuff as this, is all that is Comprehensible in *T. F.*'s Answer to the Doctor's Argument. Whatever he has more, is as *Robust* and *Staring* Nonsense as ever disgraced a Press. Thus we have had Three Samples of *T. F.*'s Abilities: One of his Skill in Antiquity (i): Another, of his Dexterity at stating the main Controversie (k). And now, a third of his nimbleness at Reasoning. But, I hope, the World, ere long, shall have a fuller Account of him from another Hand, to which I refer him.

§ XII.

THUS the Reader may see, what Stress is laid by our Brethren upon this *Mighty Plea*, That we Prelatists borrow our Arguments for establishing Prelacy from the Papists. I had the Luck to *Stumble on Popish Arguments*. But D. M. was an avowed Plagiary (as *Jameson* calls him) a *Perpetual Shadow*, a constant *Ape* of the Jesuits. And yet after all, praised be God, *Doctor Monro*, as he lived, so he died, as far from *Popery* as from *Presbytery*; and I hope, with God's Grace, to do so too. And as for the *Plea*, I shall only observe about it, 1. That it is not necessarily True, 2. That 'tis certainly Senseless, and 3. That it is monstrously Shameless.

§ XIII.

1. IT is not necessarily true, that the Prelatic Advocates borrow their Arguments from the Papists. Dare our Presbyterian Brethren deny, that many of the Advocates for Prelacy in *Britain*, within these 120 Years, have been Men as learn'd, as well seen in both Scriptures and Fathers, as any Papist of them all? Dare they say that the Papists have better Copies of either Scriptures or Fathers, than the Protestant Prelatists have had? Or will they say that the Protestant Advocates for Prelacy wanted Heads to form Arguments from plain Texts of Scripture, or plain Testimonies of Antiquity, as well as Papists can do? Why then borrow their Arguments from

from the *Papists*, when they had Opportunities and Abilities to derive them more immediately, and thereby more securely, from the true Fountains? In short, our *British* Prelatists have been so far from needing Help from *Papists* in the Controversies concerning Church Government, that they have managed these Controversies incomparably better and more accurately than any *Papist* I have seen. And without an extraordinary Impudence, our Presbyterian Brethren cannot deny, that the *Prelatists* have been the Men in *Britain*, who have most Learnedly, most Irresistibly, and upon the best and surest Principles overthrown the very Foundations of *Popery*. And here, I might enter into a large Field of Discourse; but I will not: Only, in a word, I desire to know, who were the chief Champions for the Protestant Cause, in *Britain*, for some Years, not long since expired: Were they either *Scottish* or *English* Presbyterians? And as for *D. Monro* (for whose sake I insist so much on this Ridiculous Plea) there is not an Argument in all his Book which he might not have had, though he had never in his Life read one Line of a *Papish* Author. He had Head, and he had Opportunity to have collected them all from the true Fountains; the Holy Scriptures and the Records of the Primitive Church. And, had he been for borrowing, he might have borrowed enough from sincere Protestant Authors: particularly, that Argument (so ridiculously attacked by *G. R.* with the Imputation of *Popery*) that we have the same (if not better) Evidence for *Episcopacy*, than we have for the Canon of the Scriptures, &c. The Doctor might have had (if he was obliged to borrow) from the admirable Mr. *Dodwell* in his *Dissertations on Irenaeus* (1), where (1) *Dissert. 1.* it is so digested and prosecuted, as neither *G. R.* nor *T. F.* nor § XXXV. &c. *W. J.* none of the Tribe, no not the General Assembly shall ever be able to answer it. But this is not all. For,

2. GRANTING this Plea were true, yet it is certainly § XIV. most Senseless. For, say, that we borrowed Arguments from the *Papists*, what are they the worse for that, if otherwise they are good? I thought the value of an Argument had depended on its Intrinsic Force; and if it had enough of that, it mattered not who had used it. † And how can the borrow- † *Henderson told the King,* that he used *Papish* Arguments, &c. And the King answers *Pap. 1. § 5.* To say that an Argument is ill, because the *Papists* use it; or that such a thing is good, because it is the Custom of some of the Reformed Churches cannot weigh with me, until you prove these to be Infallible, or those to maintain no Truth.

ing of an Argument from *Papists* infer that the *Borrower* is inclin'd to *Popery*? St. Paul borrowed Arguments from *Aratus* (m) *Ag. 17. 28.* (m) and *Epimenides* (n) two Heathen Poets: Was he therefore (n) *Tit. 1. 12.* an Heathen Poet? Must every Man be a *Pagan Philosopher* who borrows an Argument from *Plato* or *Cicero* to prove the Soul immortal? Must all Christians be Devils, because (as they) the Devil has sometimes confessed our Saviour to be the Son of God? Come, Gentlemen, you *W. I.* and you *T. F.* and you *G. R.* supposing you were engag'd with a *Socinian*, concerning the *Divinity* or the *Satisfaction* of our Lord, would you carefully abstain from all Arguments which at any time had been used by any *Papist*, for establishing these Great and Fundamental Articles of our Religion? If you did so, methinks you should make an admirable Congress of it. If not, what could you have to say to the *Socinian*, when he should tell you, Fy for Shame, Gentlemen, are you *Papists*? is not that a *Popish Argument*? Suppose, again, you were to write against the *Belgic Remonstrants* concerning *Irrespective Decrees*, or the *Irresistibility* of Grace, or so, would you only use such Arguments as had never been used by *Dominican* or *Jansenist*? Or, suppose the Scuffle to be between you, and some of the Disciples of *Erasmus*, concerning the *Intrinsic Power* of the Church, would you set aside every Text of Scripture, and every Testimony of Antiquity, and every reasoning that has been insisted on by *Papists* and *Prelatists* in their Management of the Controversie? May *Prelatists*, for by the natural Consequences of the *Plea* we are now considering, you are bound, as you would avoid the *Scandal* of *Prelacy*, to avoid all Arguments used by *Prelatists* for asserting the *Intrinsic Power* of the Church. Nay, you are bound, for any thing I can see, to *Renounce* the *Intrinsic Power* of the Church. For, blessed be God, all *Prelatists* are not *Latitudinarians*: There are (as there have always been) at this day, in *Britain*, *Prelatists*, as Learn'd, as Pious, as Conscientious, as True Sons of the Church, as Sincere Christians, (Christians that can bear the Cross for Christ's sake) as any within the *Island*, who are as Resolute, as Zealous, as much concern'd for the *Intrinsic Power* of the Church, and upon as good (I may say much better) Principles as any *Presbyterian*, not in *Scotland* only, but in *Christendom*. By these Hints, Gentlemen, you may per,

perceive how *Senseless* your *Plea* is; and you cannot be the Men you pretend to be, if you do not see that my reasoning might have gone much higher: But I proceed.

2. A S this your *Plea* is ridiculously *Senseless*, so 'tis monstrously *Shameless*. What can be more *Impudent* than to make that a *Mighty Scandal* in us, which you your selves do every day practice, with the fullest Freedom, without any *Signs of Remorse*, without any *Symptoms of Hesitation*? Tell me, upon your Ingenuity, from whom you have your Arguments for *Defensive Arms*? for *Resisting Sovereign Princes*, the *Powers that are of God*, and immediately *Subordinate to God*? For all your *King-killing*, and *King-deposing Doctrines*? Is every Argument used by Mr. *Rutherford* in his *Lex Rex*, purely of *Scottish Presbyterian Invention*? Is there never so much as an *Hint* of any One of them all in the Writings of *Bellarmin*, or *Suarez*, or *Mariana*? Or were these Three, Zealous, Orthodox, Over-Sea, Protestant Divines (o)? Is there never a *Grain of Jesuitish Mixture* (not to mention your Covenants) in the *Act* of the *West Kirk*, nor in *Ius Populi* *Vindicatum*, nor in *Naphthali*, nor the *Hind let loose*, &c. Has not your famous Historian *Calderwood* (p), recorded a very pretty Story concerning *John Craig* and his *Concluding Argument* for the *Lawfulness of Dethroning Kings*; "This goodly Argument, that in the Year 1553, he was in the University of *Bononia*, where he heard a Learned and Famous Man, *Thomas de Finola*, Rector of the University, sustain the *Deposing Principles*, to the great Satisfaction of the whole University, and particularly of *Vincentius de Placentia*, who affirm'd the Assertion to be most true and certain, agreeable both with the Law of God and Man? And has not *Calderwood* told you that none opposed *Craig* but *Court Flatterers*? Now who can doubt that; especially, at that time, the University of *Bononia* (a City within the Pope's own Territories, and to which the Pope, for the greater Security to his own Interests, called the Council of *Trent*, much about that time that *Craig* was there q), was a *Protestant University*, and *Thomas de Finola*, and *Vincentius de Placentia* were two strict *Scottish Presbyterians*? But to return to our Controversies concerning Church Government: I might ask you divers Questions, Gentlemen, but that I may

XXV.

(o) Is there no Affinity nor Consanguinity between Samuel's Letters and the Divinity of the Popish Mysticks?
(p) Cald. Hist. P. 37, 38.

(q) The Council by the Popes Order was removed from Trent to Bononia, Anno 1543.

neither

neither weary my self nor you; I shall only propose Three.

§ XVI.

FROM whom had you your distinction which has been so useful to you, and done you so many Services; this, I mean, That *Bishops* and *Presbyters* do not make *Two different Orders*, but only *Two Degrees* of the *same Order* of the *Priesthood*. How had you ever had the Benefit of *Blondel's* Apology for *St. Jerom's* Opinion, if he had not had this *Distinction*? Now, from whom had he it? from whom had all of your Party it, but from the *Popish Schoolmen*? Again, do not all of you, with all your might, reject our Position, that *Bishops*, as making a *Peculiar College*, an *Order distinct* from the *Order of Presbyters*, are the *Successors* of the *Apostles* in the *Supreme Power Ecclesiastical*? And what are your Arguments for rejecting this our Position? Do not you say that *Apostles* were not *Ordinary* but *Extraordinary Pastors*, by *special Commission*, and, by Consequence, such as could have no *Formal Successors*? Do not you say, that *Apostles* could *preach* and *found Churches* all the *World* over, which *Bishops* cannot? That *Apostles* could *write Canonical Books*, and were *Infallible*, &c. That they had the *Gifts of Tongues*, and *Miracles*, and *Unlimited Jurisdiction*, &c. which *Bishops* cannot pretend to? Are not these and such as these, the great *Differences* you use to assign between *Apostles* and *Bishops*? And now, Gentlemen, consider what you have on the Margent (r), and harden your Fore-heads, and say, they are not the *Jesuit Bellarmin's* own Reasonings. My third Instance you shall hear of by and by, when I have once stated your other Plea, which is,

(r) *Bellarmin* having laid down this Position (for a Reason we

may hear of before we have done) That all *Bishops* have their *Jurisdiction*, not immediately from *Christ*, but from the *Pope*, *De Rom. Pont. Lib. 4. Cap. 24*. He applies himself to *Cap. 24* to answer *Objections*, and the First, is, that *Bishops* are the *Apostles* *Successors*: But the *Apostles* had their *Power* immediately from *Christ*. Now, to take his Answer in his own Words. *Episcopi non succedunt propriè Apostolis, quoniam Apostoli non fuerunt Ordinarii sed Extraordinarii & quasi Delegati Pastores quibus non succeditur.*—*Nullam habent Episcopi partem verè Apostolicæ Authoritatis: Apostoli poterant in toto terrarum Orbe prædicare & fundare Ecclesias: Hoc non possunt Episcopi. Item Apostoli poterant scribere Libros Canonicos—hoc non possunt Episcopi. Apostoli habuerunt Donum Linguarum & Miraculorum: Non habent Episcopi. Apostoli in totam Ecclesiam habuerunt Jurisdictionem: Non habent Episcopi. Præterea non succeditur propriè nisi præcedenti. At simul fuerunt in Ecclesia Apostoli & Episcopi.*

II. THAT

II. That *Prelacy* proves the way to the *Papacy*: The same § XVII. Reason that raises a Bishop above Presbyters, may likewise Raise an Archbishop over Bishops, and a Patriarch over Archbishops; and a Pope over Patriarchs, as *Smethynius* forms it (s). This (s) p. 23. is a pretty old Bug bear: *Beza* (so far as I can learn) was the first Man that set it on Foot in Scotland (t): Much about that same time (perhaps, by *Beza's* Influence too) *Cartwright* (t) Epist. 79. advanced it in England (u). Never Presbyterian almost has to Knox. An. omitted it since: Well, could Mr. *Andrew Melvin* set off such (u) 1572. an Argument: Well, could he tell that the Popes Head could (u) See A B. not Stand but on Episcopal Shoulders, and those who Build the Whiggin's De- Beast up to the Neck, do well deserve to be called the Parents fence of the Answer to the of the Monster (v). And Twenty such Witticisms. I might Admonition, weary you, Gentlemen, (for to you the Three Champions, I p. 380. continue to direct my Discourse) with Citations from your (v) At constat Authors to this purpose. But I need not: you cannot but be Papæ Caput acquainted with your own Books, which you your selves have non aliis posse niti humeris written. And you cannot but remember, that you have been quam Episco- palibus. Et very careful (every one of you) that the People should not qui Bestiam forget such a weighty Argument against Prelacy. How often, ad ipsum usq; in one no very large Book, have you, Mr. *Jameson*, put them Collum stru- unt merito in mind of it (w)? And you G. R. have given the Defiance to promonstri parentibus to all the Word to answer it (x). Nor are you T. F. inferiour habendi. after your way, that is, with very much Spite, and very Melvin contra little Sense (y). Now, for answer. Tilenam. Cap.

9 § 11. Vide plura Cap. 11. § 4. Cap. 13. § 12. 19. And upon this Score, he damns all the Fathers who seem to depose for Episcopacy, as smelling rankly of Popery. E. g. Cap. 7 § 12. Quam piget tædet in Christi Ecclesiæ Regimine, Patres hos vestros pro principiis ponere? Quid non Urgebit Avaritiæ fucus Ambitionis focus, Patrum hæc facies Ecclesiæ veræ facies? And Cap. 14. § 35. Plutizat Papa Papizant Patres Patrizant Posteris, &c. Nothing more frequent in him than such spiteful Jingles.

(w) Mr. *Jameson* in his Preface to his *Nazianzeni Querela*: In the very Title of his Introduction: And in more than twenty places in his Book, repeats this Argument. See Book p. 16. 49. 99. 100. 103. 104. 105. 111. 197. 207. 211. 213. 231. 237.

(x) G. R. Is at it in every Book. See *Good Old Way* defended. p. 4. 45. 79. 141. And in *Rational Defence of Nonconformity*. p. 191, 192. He challenges D. *Stillingfleet* or any Man to answer it.

(y) Mr. *Forrester* seems to have design'd his Preface to his *Rectius Instruendum* for a continued Repetition of this Argument. *Mystery Babylon! Mystery Prelacy! What an Abyss of Deceit is here*: And, in short, our present Testimony (viz. of Presbyterians against Prelacy) is the same with that of the Witnesses against the Beast: And our Adversaries stand arraigned under Antichrist's Banner, in the whole Series, at least, and Complex Farrago of their Principles. It would be Nauseous to transcribe the Spite and Nonsense he has vomited in his Books, in Pursuance of this Argument.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

I. THIS, Gentlemen, is the third Instance of your *Modesty*, I promised to put you in mind of: For (to be short and plain) it is purely a *Sophism* which you have *borrowed* from the *Papists*. *Bellarmin* has it as handsomely dress'd, and as takingly set off, as ever any of you had it: As you may see by his own Words on the Margent (2). *Nicholas Sanders* in his Book entituled, *The Rock of the Church, wherein the Primacy of the Pope is proved, &c.* printed at *Louvain, An. 1567.* (i. e. 5 Years before *Beza* sent it to *Scotland*) has it: Take his own words. You have them Chap. 2. p. 20. *If the whole militant Church* (says he) *be one certain particular Body, of a certain Administration and Condition—it must needs follow, that over the whole Militant House of God, one only Master and Governour is set, whom we all ought to obey as our chief Ruler on Earth. And so by the Superiority which Experience sheweth to belong to one in every Parish* (Observe, Gentlemen, how deep he lays the Foundation of the Argument, even in Presbytery itself) *We come by the Force of the same Reason to acknowledge one chief Pastor in the great Parish of this World, of which kind St. Peter was whilst he lived.* Nay, neither was he the first *Papist* that used it: It was one of their first Rate Arguments for the Pope's Supremacy: When *John Calvin* wrote his *Institutions* (as we shall learn by and by) which was long before the Fatal Controversie between the Prelatists and Presbyterians was begun. Nor do I doubt but you may find it in many Popish Authors who wrote before the Reformation of Religion was set on foot by *Martin Luther*.

Catholic Church should have one visible Head, runs thus. Sexta Ratio ducitur a similitudine. Recte in singulis locis singuli constituantur Episcopi qui cæteris omnibus ejus loci Ministris & Pastoribus præsent. — Rursus in provinciis singulis recte constituuntur Singuli Metropolitani qui suæ Provinciæ Episcopis præsideant, & in majoribus Urbibus Prælati seu Patriarchæ qui Curam suscipiant Ampliorem. — Æquum igitur est ut sit etiam aliquis unus qui toti Ecclesiæ præsit, & cui Prælati quoque & Patriarchæ subiciantur: Nam si Monarchicus Principatus convenit uni Civitati, uni Provinciæ, uni Nationi, cur non etiam Ecclesiæ Universæ? Quæ ratio postulat ut partes Monarchicæ, Totum autem Aristocraticè gubernetur? Deinde, quibus Rationibus probatur debere unum Episcopum præesse Parochis, Archiepiscoporum Episcopis, Patriarcham Archiepiscopis, iisdem probari potest unum Pontificem summum præesse debere Patriarchis. Cur necessarius est in singulis Ecclesiis unus Episcopus, nisi quia una Civitas non potest bene regi nisi ab uno? At etiam una est Ecclesia Universalis. Item, cur unus requiritur Archiepiscopus nisi ut contineantur Episcopi in Unitate, ut dissolvantur eorum Lites; ut ad Synodum convocentur; ut cogantur fungi suo munere? at propter easdem Causas requiritur unus qui Archiepiscopis & Prælatibus omnibus præsit. De Rom. Pont. Lib. 1. Cap. 9.

And

And now, I would ask with what Countenance you can insist on such an Argument, according to your own Principles? How can you be so *Papaturient* (to use one of your own Terms) as thus to *borrow* an Argument from the Papists? But this is not all. For,

2. YOU who are so learn'd in the Controversies about § XIX Church-Government, cannot but have observed, that this same very Argument, (at least, upon the matter) has been as much insisted on by your Brethren the *Independents*, and other *Sectarians*, against your Scheme, as by you against ours. How often have they told you, that your Subordination of Classes has as natural a Tendency towards *Papish Tyranny*, as our Subordination of Officers? No doubt you have seen Doctor Heylin's *Aerius Redivivus*. Now, I remember, he somewhere there (a) tells you, that the latter Separatists (the *Brownists*, (a) Cap. II. &c.) who upon the very Principles of Cartwright, and the Num. I. rest of the Non-Conformists in England, did separate from these their Genuine Parents; he tells us, I say, that these new Separatists, *As to Forms of Government*, did declare thus, that as they which live under the Tyranny of the Pope and Cardinals, worship the very Beast itself; and they which live under the Government of Archbishops and Bishops, do worship the Image of the Beast; so that they which willingly obey the Reformed Presbytery, of Pastors, Elders, and Deacons, worship the Shadow of that Image. I can as little doubt of your having seen *Martin-mar-priest* his *Arraignment of Persecution*, published, An. 1645. Now that brave Author does even entertain you with the same Civil Complements with which you use to entertain your Betters. Would you have a Sample of him? Making mention of you, he chuffs to describe you thus. *He hath acquired the name of Sir John Presbyter: in truth he is a Priest, the Son of a Bishop, Grandchild to the Pope; and the Devil is his great Grandfather; all Murderers and Butchers of God's People* (b). Again, he says (b) p. 22. of Sir John, that he was Sanctified from his Mother's Womb, the Synodian Whore of Babylon (c). And, ——— His God- (c) p. 25. fathers and God-mothers, in his Baptism, wherein he was made a member of the Assembly, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Antichrist (d). Once more, as for Sir John Presbyter, this Court hath voted him to the Unclean, Filthy, Impious, Unboly, (d) p. 31. Dark and Wordly Dungeon, called *Jure Humano*, therewith

(e) p. 45.

Archbishops and Bishops, &c. the Grand Presbyters, his Forefathers——(e) Farther, some of you, I am confident, have seen a Sermon preached by *Peter Sterry*, on *Jeremiah 16. 14, 15.* Entitled, *Englands Deliverance from Northern Presbytery, compared with its Deliverance from the Roman Papacy*; dedicated to the *Supreme Authority* in the *Commonwealth* of *England*, the *High Court of Parliament*: Printed at *Leith* by *Evan Tyler*, *An. 1652.* Now that Gentleman spake his mind pretty freely as well as *Martin*. In the *Epistle Dedicatory*, he tells his *Patrons*, that *the same Spirit which lay in the polluted Bed of Papacy, may meet them in the perfumed Bed of Presbytery.* And in the *Sermon* itself (f), he first adduces *Six Agreements* between *Popery* and *Presbytery*: And then *Four Differences*, in each whereof the *Presbyterian* is worse than the *Papist*. I remember likewise to have seen a Book bearing this Title, *Rome ruin'd by Whitehall*, or the *Papal Crown demolish'd*; containing a *Confutation of the Three Degrees of Popery*, viz. *Papacy, Prelacy and Presbytery*; answerable to the *Triple-Crown of the Three headed Cerberus the Pope*, with his *Three-fold Hierarchies* aforesaid, &c. By *John Spittlehouse*, *Assistants* to the *Marshal-General* of the *Army*, under the *Command* of his *Excellency*, the *Lord General Fairfax*. Printed at *London* (and with an *Imprimatur* too, by *Thomas Paine*, &c. *An. 1650.*

(f) p. 16. &c.

§. XX.

I DOUBT not but it might be easie to any Man who should think fit to employ himself that way, to cite Multitudes of such Books: But I shall content my self with other Three: particularly, the *Dissenting Brethren* (the *Independents*) in their *Reasons against the Westminster Assembly's Third Proposition concerning Presbyterianial Government*, do, no less than 4 or 5 times pretend, that the *Presbyterians* especially in that part of their Scheme which establishes the *subordination of Classes*, proceed upon *Prelatic*, and by consequence, upon *Papish Principles*. And *Thomas Hooker*, sometimes *Pastor* of the Church at *Harford*, upon *Connecticott* in *New-England*, in his *Survey of the Summ of Church Discipline, &c.* published at *London*, *Anno 1648.* Insists very often on the *Popery of Presbytery*, E. g. Part. 1. Cap. 9. p. 97. He plainly tells, that the *Presbyterian Model*, is *Merely the Usurpation of that Man of Sin, or a Preparation to bring him in, or a Remainder of him not fully cast out, not the Natural and Native Institution of*

Saviour; &c. And *Ibid.* p. 123. He sets himself to shew, that *Presbytery* paves the way for *Prelacy*: And now, Gentlemen, you your selves use to contend as warmly as any Men, that *Prelacy* paves the way for the *Papacy*, Nay, Cap. 15. p. 251. In my retired *Meditations* (says he) I could not but observe a secret kind of *Divine Dispensation*, that the *Presbyterian Way*, must need the help of a point of *Popery*, not only as a *Pillar* by which it must be underpropped, but as a *Foundation or Head Corner Stone*, upon which the whole *Building* must rest and be erected. Twenty more such Testimonies might be adduced from him and his Brethren

MY third Book, I am sure, must be no stranger to any of you. A *Scottish Book* it is, bearing this Title, *Protesters no Subverters, and Presbytery no Papacy*. I need not give you the History of it: You *G. R.* no doubt can give it as well as any Man. Now, how frequently do the *Protesters* in that little Book, insist on this way of reasoning, that the *Submission* to the *Judicatories* of the *Church*, required by the *Resolutioners*, was a plain *Step* of *Popish Tyranny*? They say, that to require such a *Submission*, or pretend that it is so essential to *Presbyterian Government*, is to introduce into the *House of God* a *Kirk Government*, that is too nigh of Kin to that which is *Popish Prelatical and Tyrannical* (g). That to say, that without such *Submission*, *Unity*, and *Order*, cannot be continued in the *Kirk*, is the very *Argument and Language* of the *Advocates* of the *See of Rome*, whilst they plead for the *Pope's visible Headship*, &c. (h) And, will our Brethren, under a *Pretext* of *Order*, destroy *Christian Liberty*, and bring in *Popish Tyranny* (i)? — Was there Justice or Necessity to persecute all those who did plead and bear Testimony against the open Breach of a sworn *Covenant and Engagement*? We know no *Precedent* or *Parallel* that our Brethren can shew for this, unless they fetch it from *Times* of *Popery* and *Prelacy* (k). — This *Submission* is *Prelatical*, and introduceth a *Lordly and absolute Power and Dominion* in the *Church* of *God*, over the *Flock* and *Ministers* of *Jesus Christ*, &c. (l) Nay (l) p. 115. this *Submission* is so far from being any part of the *Catholic Truth*, much less of the *Essence and Being* of *Presbyterian Government*, that it seems to be a *Tenet* purely *Popish and Antichristian*, and pleads for a *Government* that is not *Presbyterian* but *Popish and Antichristian*: Who knoweth not that the *Favorites* and *Emis-*

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

rics of the See of Rome, do with might and main, plead for this
 (m) p. III. II. 2. *Absolute and Unlimited Subjection, &c. (m) ?*
 § XXII.

AS I have said, it might have been easie to have shewn more fully, how this your Argument of *Prelacy's paving the Way for Popery*, has been, with very little Alteration, turn'd against your selves, by your own Offspring. So that you are as much concern'd, as we, to purge your selves of the Popular Scandal. For my part, I would gladly see what you can answer for your selves, which will not be as much Subservient to our Purgation. I know what the *publick Resolutioners*, in their *Review and Examination* of the last named Book, answered to the *Protesters*. They grant it is an *Old Charge against the Presbyterian Constitution, that it has Popish Mixtures*: But it is to be considered, that all Governments do agree in some common Principles. They plead, that the *Assembly, 1648, Aug. 5. Sess. 30.* have borrowed a Canon from the *Prelatists*: They say that all *Popish Maxims of Government* are not to be rejected, otherwise the *Protesters* might as well Reject the *Baptism of Infants*, and *Deposition of Ministers*; and the *Excommunication of Members*; and innumerable other things, as *Matters purely Popish and Antichristian, because (forsooth) they are observed in the Romish Church* (n). Now, Gentlemen, I hope you will for once be so ingenuous, as to acknowledge, that it needs cost us no hard Labour, to shew, that we can with as good Reason, as the *Resolutioners*, pretend to the benefit of all these Pleas: Especially we who are for the *Divine* (or, which is all one, the *Apostolic*) *Institution of Episcopacy*. They have much more (o) which will also as well (if not much better) make for us as for them. E. g. They say they do not derive the Necessity of Submission from the *Infallibility of the Judicatories*, and that herein they differ from the *Papists*. Now, you know very well, that we do no more pretend the *Infallibility of our Bishops*, than they of their *Judicatories*. They do not urge Submission to any *Judge Incompetent*: We say our Bishop is our Competent Superiour. They plead only for Submission to *Ecclesiastical Courts*, they are not *Erastians*: And we as little as they. They plead not for Submission to *Officers and Judicatories which are not of Christ's Institution*. We say the same, and, as We think, upon much better Grounds. And now, Gentlemen, are we not as fairly

purged

(n) p. 92, 93.

(o) p. 94. &c.

purged of Popery, as those of your own Party could purge themselves of it when they were put to it? Nay,

EVEN you your self, Mr. Jameson, (see confidently and frequently as you have repeated the pitiful *Sophism* we are now considering) have furnished us with the Substance of a very Good and a Satisfactory Answer to it. You may remember, D. G. Barnett in his *Fourth Conference*, brought in your Friend *Isotimus* with the Argument in his Mouth (p. 106) p. 311. And *Polyhistor* retorting it to this purpose: *May not one that Quarrels a standing Ministry argue on the same Grounds; a Minister's Authority over the People gave the Authority Bishops pretend over Ministers; and so the Ministry will be concluded the first Step of the Beast's Throne?* 'Tis true, you talk of it a little disdainfully, as if the Doctor's *Spirits* had been far spent, when he came in with such a *Retorsion*: But whatever Influence your Confidence may have with the *Rabble* of your Party, you must allow me to tell you, that I am persuaded you saw the *Retorsion* was *Vigorous* and *Pungent*: No Man of common Sense but must perceive it: For your reasoning is, if there had been no *Bishops* there had been no *Pope*: And the Doctor's is every inch as good; if there had been no *Presbyters*, there had been no *Bishops*. Or, to give it as we had it not long ago from your Grand Father, Mr. *Andrew Melvin*; if the *Pope's Head* cannot but stand on *Episcopal Shoulders*, then to be sure *Presbyters* must be included (and concluded Supporters of *Antichrist*) before we come to the *Lowest Step*: For *Episcopal Shoulders* could never have stood but on *Presbyterian Legs*. That you saw the Force of this *Retorsion*, I say, seems evident, from the Difficulty ye was reduced to, to find an Answer to it: For certainly, had you not been difficulted in the matter, you had never chosen an Answer which makes as much for us, as possibly it can do for your Party. Consider it again, and confess how easie it is for us to apply it to our Case. Your words are, *Take Gospel Ministry unconfounded with a Papal Hierarchy, and then there is not the least colour or pretext for any Man's ascribing to it the first Rise of Popery, the Parity we plead for among Pastors of Flocks, secures a Gospel Ministry from any Force or Appearance of Reason in any such assult* (q). Now what can run more smoothly than, with little Alteration, this way of reasoning does for us? Here it is. Take a *Gospel Episcopacy* unconfounded with a *Papal Hierarchy*, and then there is not

(q) Nazianz. Quærel p. 105. 106.

the

A Vindication of a Discourse Entituled,

the least Colour or Pretext for any Man's ascribing to it the first Rise of Popery. The Parity we plead for among Bishops secures a Gospel Episcopacy from any Force or Appearance of Reason in any such Assault, as is commonly made by Presbyterians, who are not ashamed to come in with such a Popish Sophism as a Prejudice against Episcopacy. This seems to be enough for you Mr. Jamieson.

§ XXV.

AS for you G. R. and T. F. though (considering you have never been Men so singularly circumspect and wary in attending all the little Consequences that may follow from your Principles and Reasonings) I doubt not a little pains in turning over your Books might afford me as good Answers to this Argument we are now examining, as might in reason satisfy you; yet I cannot at present take Leisure to do it. Neither will I weary you with rehearsing what our Men have return'd to it; because perhaps you will even loath Demonstration itself, when proceeding from the Mouths or Pens of Prelates. Two things therefore I will only tell you. 1. That all those Presbyterian Writers (and they are not a few) who have acknowledged Episcopacy to be a Lawful or a Tolerable Government, if they were Men that regarded Consequences, (which if they did not, themselves and their Books are the less to be regarded) they were likewise fairly bound to have frankly confessed, that Prelacy doth not necessarily infer Popery. For how can that be a Lawful or Tolerable Government which necessarily brings in Antichrist? Nay I cannot persuade my self, that even you your selves will be so inconsiderate, as to affirm, that there is any necessary Connexion between them. Certainly you are not to be told (considering that you are University Men, and that too of the First Rate, at least by your present Stations) that where Causes work Necessarily, they work not only Uniformly, but Constantly. Neither need you be told (if ye are worthy of your present Stations) that since ever Episcopacy was in the Church it has been somewhere without Popery. You cannot but know, that there was Episcopacy long before either the Prelate of Constantinople or Rome did set up for being Universal Bishop. You cannot but know, that even after the Bishop of Rome pretended to be the Head of the Catholic Visible Church, yet there were always Hundreds of Bishops in Christendom, that never own'd him for such. Sure I am, you

you need not be told, that he has not been *own'd*, but most Keenly and Zealously rejected by all the *Bishops* in *Britain*, these 140 Years. Now if it was not *Necessarily*, but only by *Accident*, that *Episcopacy* (as you pretend) made *Way* for the *Papacy*, I hope you are both better *Philosophers* and better *Christians* too, than to say that *Episcopacy* is the *worse* for the *Papacy's* following it by *Chance*. I think I need not use a word more to shew you, what Absurdities would follow upon the saying of it. I need not tell you, I say, that it would not only strike against *Presbytery*, which even by your *own* Principles, gave *Occasion* to *Episcopacy*; but against *Christianity* itself: For, to be sure, *Christianity* may be said to have given *Occasion* to both *Preiacy* and *Popery*. But this is not all, For,

2. MANY whom you are earnest to have reckoned \$ XXV. among your best Friends, have been at pains to shew, that between *Episcopacy* and *Popery* there is no *Connexion*; and there is no Consequence from the *One* to the *Other*. One who had your Opportunities (I mean the use of good Libraries) might perhaps cite very many: But it may stand me very fair, if I can give you such a *Jury* of them as do most Unanimously *absolve* us from being *Friends* to the *Papacy*, by our being for *Episcopacy*; inasmuch as they do most willingly depose, that your Argument (now under Consideration) is of no value. I told you before, that it was a *Popish* Argument? I tell you now, that never an Author almost, even of your own Party, has written against *Popery*, but has answered it: Nay, and ridicul'd it: Particularly, Mr. *Calvin*, *Antonius Sadeel*, another *Genevian*; *Pezelius*, *Limbertus Danaus*; *Whitakerus*, *Franciscus Junius*, *Samuel Huberus*, *Daniel Chamierus*, *Amesius*, *Abrahamus Ramburtius*, *Salmassius*, *Samuel Marefius*, *Wendelinus*, *Franciscus Turretinus*, *Philippus à Limborgh*. Here are XV as I said, a full *Jury*. You have their Depositions on the Margent (r).

(r) Calvin
Instit. Lib. IV.

CAP. VI § 2. States the matter thus. Utrum ad verâ Hierarchiæ seu Ecclesiastici Ordinis Rationem necesse sit sedem unam inter alias & Dignitate & Potestate emineret, ut sit totius corporis caput. Then he shews that the Argument taken from the Jewish High-Priest doth no service to the Pope: Now that which I observe, is, that his Reasoning exactly answers our present Argument: Quod in Natione una fuit utile (says he) id in Universum Orbem extendere nulla ratio cogit. Imo Gentis unius & totius Orbis longe diversa erit ratio. — Nunc ubi vera Religio in totum orbem diffusa est, uni dari Orientis & Occidentis Moderationem, quis non videat esse prorsus absurdum?

Perinde.

Perinde enim est ac si quis contendat totum Mundum à Præfecto uno debere regi, quia Ager unus non plures Præfectos habeat. *And again, § 8.* Atqui illud inquitur (*Pontificali*) non minus in Naturæ Universalitate quam in singulis partibus locum habet, ut sit unum summum omnium caput. Et hujus rei, si Deo placeret, probationem sumunt à Gruibus & Apibus, quæ sibi ducem unum semper eligunt, non plures. Recipio sane quæ proferunt exempla. Sed an ex toto orbe confluunt Apes ut regem unum eligant? Suis alvearibus contenti sunt Reges Singuli. Ita in Gruibus, unaquæque Caterva proprium Regem habet. Quid inde aliud evinceretur quam singulis Ecclesiis deberi suos Episcopos attribui? *Indeed the whole Chapter over his most nervously defeats our Brother's Argument, and particularly § 17. where he cites this Saying of St. Cyprian's, Episcopatus unus est ejus à Singulis in Solidum pars tenetur, &c. And holds it to be (as it is indeed) inconsistent with the Pope's Supremacy; and utterly subversive of it.*

2. Antonius Sadeel, *against Turrianus the Jesuit: (Opp. p. 584. Edit. 1593.) insists on the same Saying of St. Cyprian's, and makes the Cyprianic Episcopacy (which I have shown above, Chap. 3. § 45. he acknowledged to have been proper) so far from being Introductive of, that 'tis absolutely inconsistent with the Papacy.*

3. Pezelius in *Refut. Catechismi Jesuit. p. 32. answering their Argument for a visible Head, &c. Writes thus.* Deinde, ut maxime unus aliquis ex Apostolorum Successoribus arrogare sibi voluisset Officium Capitæ Ministerialis Catholici, impossibile tamen fuisset unum Ecclesiæ Universalis sufficere: Præterea etsi unum potest esse unius alienius Ecclesiæ particularis caput Ministeriale, instar unius Inspectoris quem Græci nominant Episcopum, tamen Universalis Ecclesiæ Unitas nequaquam dependet ex uno capite simili Universalis—Nam ut omnes Ecclesiæ particulares eorumque Membra unæ sint Ecclesiæ Catholica, satis est eas esse consociatas in Christo, agnitione Evangelii ipsius, & usu Sacramentorum legitimo.

4. Lambertus Dacrus (ad Cap. 9. 3tiæ Controv. Bellarm.) *Answers thus to Bellarmine's Sixth Ratio, which you have above. (§ XVIII.)* peccat à dicto secundum quid. Potest unus Episcopus uni Ecclesiæ satisfacere, ergo & toti orbi terrarum. Potuit Lyceus cernere usque ad 12 Leucas quid gerebatur ergo potuit cernere quid ubique terrarum fieret. Sunt hæ rationes ineptissime, &c.

5. Whistlerus *Contr. 4. Qu. 1. Cap. 3. § 15. Answers thus.* Non sequitur Argumentum à singulis Ecclesiis ad totum, ut quia singulæ singulos Episcopos habent, ergo tota unum qui cunctis præsit habere debeat. Apertæ discriminis rationes sunt. Quia sic hi Metropolitani & Archiepiscopi constituti sunt ut suis Limitibus & Cancellis circumfcriberentur, extra quos egredi non liceret; & quos curare satis commode possent propter Locorum Propinquitatem. At Papa nullis Locorum aut Regionum sibi etiam remotissimis includi vult. Cumque unus Homo sit, se tamen Omnium Nationum & Populorum Episcopum per totum terrarum Orbem & ambitum esse dicit. Quam vero insanum est eorum se Episcopum profiteri quibuscum omnino nullum habere commercium potest? Orbis enim amplissimus est: in eo multæ sunt Ecclesiæ, & longissime à se invicem remotæ: Unius Cura, Cogitatio & Inspectio ad tam Multas & tam Disjunctas Ecclesias pertingere non potest.

6. Franciscus Junius (*Animadv. in Bellarm. Contr. Lib. 1. Cap. 9. Num. 55. ad Sextam Ratiõem*) Non bona Consequentia est. Si dicis unus homo præsit uni particulari Ecclesiæ, ergo & unus toti. Hoc vero negamus consequi aut verum esse, quia unus homo illud nec debet (non enim id in mandatis habet) nec potest.

7. Chamier (*Lib. 9. Cap. 14. § 4.*) *Answers it thus.* Negatur Consequentia. Ut enim non sequitur, si singulæ familie unum habent patremfamilias ergo & cunctas. Si singula Regna, unum Regem, ergo & omnia. Ita non est consequens, ut omnibus Ecclesiis unus præsit Episcopus quia singulis singulis: atque adeo hoc quidem, nimirum

mirum ut singuli Episcopi singulis præessent Ecclesiis, fuit olim constitutum & observatum *Evangelicæ* gratia; illud vero, ut unus omnibus, nunquam.

8. Amelius (Bellarm. Enerv. Tom. 1. p. 185. Edit. Oxon. 1629) *to the argument.* Oportet aliquem Petro succedere, &c. *Returns this for an answer:* Si Successio conceditur; non est igitur necessarium ut unus aliquis in Solidum, quasi Hæres ejus ex Asse, sit Petri successor. Imperatori in initio uni succedebant postea duo; unus in Oriente, & alter in Occidente. Fuerunt etiam inter Scholasticos, qui docuerunt Ecclesiam posse simul duos summos Pontifices creare & habere; ut Armacanus, de Quest. Armen. Lib. 7. C. 17. & Occam in Dialog. part. 3. ad fin. Si autem duos, cur non & quot sunt Archiepiscopi vel Episcopi Diocesani?

9. Samuel Huberus (*Antibellarm. Lib. 1. Cornu Bestiæ 1mo Cap. 14.*) Christus Jesus nullum tale instituit Tribunal (*quale nempe est Pontificis Summi*) quod utiq; facturum fuisset, si Ecclesiæ suæ necessarium judicasset. Scimus enim quod æquali Auctoritate suos in omnes mundi partes amandarit Apostolos; qui ipsi quoque nusquam in Ecclesiis vel Monarchas se gesserunt, vel unquam alicui Monarchæ subijci eas — jussunt. Præterea horum (*Apostolorum*) quoque posteri, Canones in Conciliis constituerunt, ad vitandum Monarchicum Ecclesiæ imperium, constituentes certos in certis terræ Provinciis Archiepiscopatus.

10. Abrahamus Ramburtius (Thes. Sedan Vol. 2. Disp. de Regimine universæ Ecclesiæ militantis, Th. 22.) *answers the Argument thus.* Ordo Metropolitanorum & Patriarcharum humanus est: Papa autem primatum Divino jure sibi vindicat: Neque ita Monarchicè reguntur partes, quomodo Papa vult esse Monarcha. Plenissimam enim Jurisdictionis potestatem non habet quilibet Episcopus aut Archiepiscopus in sua Provincia. Vide Can. Apost. 34. neque potest pro arbitrio, nemine reclamante, leges figere. Demus enim Presbyteros subesse Episcopis, non tamen eis subsunt, ut Principibus. Magistris Generalibus Religiosorum subsunt Religiosi; neque tamen potestas eorum est Regia. Sed hujus Argumenti negatur consequentia. An omnibus familiis est præficiendus Pater familias unus, quia unusquisque familiæ suæ præst? Estne inter Monarchos aliquis Monachus Monarcha, quia unicuique famulatio præst? Ordinis illius Magister? Plures Legatos emittit Papa, qui superiorem non venerantur Legatum. Et multi sunt in Orbe Reges, qui Communi in terra Regi fasces non submittunt. Quod si Primas Nationem aliquam regere potest, an propterea sufficiet Administrationi totius Orbis? in Aristocratia Monarchicè regi partes possunt à Provinciis vel Urbium Prætoribus aut Præfectis; ut in Monarchia partes possunt Aristocraticè Regi. Gallia Senatus habet multos, aut Parliamenta, quibus diversæ subsunt Provinciæ.

11. Salmasius (Apparat. ad Lib. de primatu. p. 98.) Si concederetur Episcopatum de jure esse divino non tam consequeretur tabulata quæ super hoc pede plano struenda fuere æque juris esse Divini. Vide plura p. 99. 100. 156. 157. 167. 198. *This too, sometimes he seems to affirm, that Episcopacy introduced the Papacy, at p. 169. 220. 307. But for this objection I have already accounted to G. R. C. A. P. III. §. XXXIV.*

12. Samuel Maresius (*Syntag. Theol. Loc. 16. §. 5.*) ut tamen Monarchicum illud (Ecclesiæ Regimen) constituamus, quo sensu id volunt pontificii, assignando, non solum singulis Ecclesiis, aut etiam singulis Diocesibus aliquem *vegetum* (quod posita pastorum æqualitate ex jure Divino, posset tamen, ut olim factum, ex jure humano & positivo, ordinis gratia obtinere) sed omnibus Ecclesiis caput aliquod supremum cui subesse sit de necessitate salutis nunquam à nobis poterimus impetrare, cum & illud sit Tyrannicum Antichristianum, & Scripturæ contrarium; ac, propriè loquendo, plurium Ecclesiarum Regimen non nisi Aristocraticum sit. *Ad §. 6. he adds,* Illum verò titulum Episcopi Oecumenici, universalis & Episcopi Episcoporum, quo sensu Papæ tribui solet, sanior antiquitas merito damnavit; Nec ideo quod quæ ibet

Ecclesia particularis, aut quælibet Dioecesis ex humano instituto, Ordinisque servandi gratia posset unicum Pastorem vel Episcopum admittere, ut adhuc obtinet in multis Ecclesiis quæ secessionem fecerunt à sede Romana; sequetur inde omnes simul Ecclesias posse uni subesse Capiti, cum nemo queat tanto oneri par esse.

13. Fredericus Wendelinus (System. Maj. Part. 1. Cap. 28. p. 1300.) *proposes the Argument thus*: Si singulis Ecclesiis præficiendi sunt singuli Episcopi, utique omnibus Ecclesiis & Episcopis præficiendus est unus Episcopus, &c. *and answers, thus*; connexi consequentia negatur; eadem enim ratione concludi posset, omnibus Regnis præficiendum esse unum Regem, quia singulis unus est præfectus: Omnibus familiis præficiendum esse unum patrem-familias, quia singulis unus præst: Omnibus Civitatibus unum vel duos Consules esse præficiendos, quia singulis unus vel duo præfunt. Ratio quæ adfertur, nullius momenti est, nam si de Regimine inferiori & subordinato sit Sermo, quid quæso obstat quo minus id Aristocraticum esse possit, hoc est, pluribus à Monarcha & Supremo uno demandatum?

14. Franciscus Turretinus (Instit. Theol. Elenct. p. 111. Loc. 18. Qu. 16. Th. 19.) posito quod singule Ecclesiæ sint regendæ ab uno Præside confusionis vitandæ ergo; non sequitur totius orbis Ecclesias unius hominis potestati esse subjiaciendas. Et ibid. Th. 22.—Data Rectorum multiplicitate non ideo Ecclesiam scindi vel in plures dividi consequens est, quam regnum unum in multa regna dividi, cum singulis Provinciis singuli præficiuntur Proreges quorum nullus in alium habeat Imperium: unde Cyprianus de Episcoporum multitudine loquens. Lib. de Unit. Ecclesiæ, Episcopatus unus est, &c. *vide plura ibid. Qu. 13. & Qu. 20.*

15. Philippus à Limborgh, *as good a Presbyterian as most Dutchmen Remonstrant or contra Remonstrant*; (Theol. Christ. Lib. 7. Cap. 8. § 17.) *answers the Argument thus*, Antea nos ostendimus ordinem illum Archiepiscoporum & Primatum tolerari posse: si nullam in conscientias fidelium dominationem accipiat, sed Ordinis tantum in Ecclesia observandi causa introducatur: Non tamen eum esse Institutionis Divinæ sed Humanæ—Nec ex Archiepiscoporum & Primatum ordine rectè inferitur universalis totius Ecclesiæ Monarcha. Posset unus sufficere regendæ Provinciæ uni, sed non propterea toti Orbi.

16. *Left any exception should be made, (tho' I know not why) against any of these 15, I add a Sixteenth, as zealous a Presbyterian as most Frenchmen I have seen.* Moyses Amyraudus (Theol. Salmur. Part. 3. Disp. 40. Th. 26.) Si quis dicat eandem esse rationem Episcopi Romani ad Concilium Generale quæ est Episcopi particularis ad Synodum Diocesitanam, ut ille supra Generale Concilium emineat; quemadmodum hic eminet supra Synodum Diocesitanam, is semel atque iterum peccabit: primum: in eo quod non si vel necesse est, vel tolerabile singulos Episcopos singulis Diocesibus præfici, continuo vel necesse erit vel adeo ferendum, Pontificem universæ Ecclesiæ præponi. Est inter illa duo *μὴν ἄρνα.*

§ XXVI.

HERE, I say, Gentlemen, you have a full Jury of your own Friends, Unanimously determining, that *Episcopacy* doth not at all *pave* the Way for *Papery*. Read over their Answers to your Argument; and say, if you dare, that they have not demonstrated it to be perfectly Inconsequential, a naughty, Putid, silly senseless *Sophism*. Have they not told you, that to infer a *Papacy* from *Episcopacy* is just such reasoning, as if one should say, that the allow-
ing

ing *One King* in *One Kingdom*, infers that there should be an *Universal King* over all *other Kings*? Or that because there is *One Prefect* over *One Province*, there ought to be an *Universal Prefect* over all *Prefects*? Or, *One General* over all *Monks*, because every *Order* has its *General*? Or *One Legate* over all *Legates*, because there are *many Legates*? Or *One or Two Consuls* over all the *Cities* of the *World*, because every *City* is ruled by *One or Two Consuls*? Or *One Universal Father* of all *Families*, because every *particular Family* has its *Father*? Or *One Master Cran*, over all the *Crans* in the *World*, because in every *particular Flock* of *Crans* there is *One* that has the *Mastery*? Or, *One Master Bee* over all *Bees*, because in every *Hive* there is *One Master Bee*? Doth not *Calvin*, E. g. Look upon him as having an *Hive* in his *Head* who reasons at such a *Rate*? Have they not told you, that 'tis very possible for *One Bishop* to oversee *One Diocese*, but very impossible for *One Man* to oversee all the *World*? Have they not told you, that 'tis Nonsense to say, that *One* can Rule all *Nations*, as well as *One* can rule *One Nation*? As great Nonsense as to say, that he who can see at 12 Miles Distance, may see at the Distance of Twelve Thousand? Have they not told you, that every *Bishop* may rule his own *Diocese*, and the *College* of *Bishops* may Rule the *Church Catholic*, and preserve *Unity* without an *Universal Bishop*? Have not some, and these not the meanest of them, told you, that *St. Cyprian's* Principle is utterly *Exclusive* of and *Inconsistent* with the *Papacy* (s)? Has not *Salmasius* him-
self told you, that *Episcopacy* may be of *Divine Right* without a *Papacy*? (s) Calvin Sa-
deed Turretin.

TO conclude, Gentlemen, Doctor *Monro* did, and I do maintain, that *Episcopacy* is of *Divine Right*: That all *Bishops* (as the *Apostles* were) are *Equal*: And that every *Bishop* is *Immediately Subject* to *Christ*, and has his *Commission* from him; and not from any *Pope*, and that with Regard both to *Order* and *Jurisdiction*. Now these are Principles as *Irreconcilable* with *Popery* as with *Eraastianism*; or if you will, with *Presbytery*. I know very well, that you, Mr. *Jameson*, have endeavoured to banter *D. Burnet* out of a Demonstration of this great Truth, that the *Papacy* owes not its *Rise* to *Episcopacy*: The Demonstration taken from what passed in the *Council* of *Trent*, about the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy* (t).
S f f a You

(t) Burnet's
Conference
4. p. 323, 324.
Nazianz.
Querel. p. 102,
103, 104, 105.

S XXVII.

You have endeavour'd, I say, to banter him out of it; for 'tis nothing but Arrant Banter (not one word to the purpose, not one Sentence of Solid Reason) you have said in all that Debate. I am not just now at Leisure to make it appear so fully as I could: All I shall therefore say, is, That few thinking Men will readily believe, that you understand the *Pope's Interests* better than *He* himself, and all the Court of *Rome* did; better than all his Party in the *Council of Trent* did; better than all the *Jesuits*, then, and ever since have done. For my part, I think the great Author of the History of the *Council of Trent*, alone, might have entered into a Comperi-

(u) See Bel- tion with you, for true Skill in those matters. Now, all these People were very sensible, that to have declared Episcopacy to have been of *Divine Institution*, and that every Bishop had his *Power of Jurisdiction immediately from Christ*, (his Ordainers being only Instruments, not Superiours without any *D-dependance* on any *Visible* Higher Ecclesiastical Power, was utterly to have *Ruined* the *Papacy*. And Cardinal *Bel-* *larmine* (as I hinted above) has so unriddled the Mystery, that had you consulted him, I cannot imagine you could have talked so confidently as you have done against Doctor *Barnet*. You have *Bellarmin's* own Deduction of the matter on the *Margent* (u). Or, if you are not willing to rely on his Ingenuity, (though there is little Reason to think he Si habere was Disingenuous in this, if ever he was Ingenuous in any Episcopi à thing) then, consult your own *Salmasius* (v), who has indeed

Jurisdictionem, non posset Pontifex illam auferre aut mutare. Respondebunt Episcopus habere Jurisdictionem à Deo, sed tamen sub Pontifice, & ideo licere Pontifici illam tollere vel mutare. Sed contra; Apostoli habuerunt Potestatem sub Petro: & tamen quia eam habuerunt immediate à Christo, non poterat Petrus eam auferre vel imminuere. Præterea, Ordinis Potestatem habent Omnes Presbyteri, sub Pontifice; & tamen quia eam habent à Deo, non potest Pontifex eam ita tollere ut si velit, non possint ea uti. Nam Presbyter, etiam si Pontifex illum excommunicet suspendat, interdicat, degradet, tamen, si velit, vere consecrabit. Denique in qualibet Urbe Clerus & Populus subjectus est Episcopo; & tamen si quis de Clero vel Populo habet immediate à Pontifice summo aliquam Auctoritatem, non potest Episcopus illam tollere vel imminuere: Eodem modo si habere Episcopi à Christo Auctoritatem suam, non posset Christi vicarius eam tollere, &c.

(v) Vide *Salmasii Apparatum ad Lib. De Primatu Papæ. p. 99, 100. & passim præcipue vero, p. 156, 157. ubi sic.* Episcopus vel proprio jure, vel ex Concessione & Delegatione Potentioris (puta Papæ) habet Imperium. Si proprio jure Imperium in Ecclesia sua habet Episcopus non delegatum, nec Concessione majoris Potestatis datum. Omnes Episcopi inter se Equales sunt pari omnes Potestate & jure & omnes ἀπολόγοι. Quo loco igitur erit Episcopus Romæ, si in Ordinem redigatur hac Sententia & cæteris Episcopis par & æqualis fiat? Si rursus illè habeatur quasi Rex Ecclesiasticus — à quo in cæteros Episcopos, Jurisdictio descendat, cui tota & solida Jurisdictionis Potestas data sit, nec minimam quicquam in Ecclesia ejus partem nisi ab ipso habeat, quid fiet de Episcopis? Sed vide ipsum *Salmasium*, *Inflora enim sunt quæ commode transferri possint* so

to managed the matter against *Petavius*, as that he has demonstrated, either that the *Pope's Headship* must fall to the Ground; or *Bishops* must have their Power from *Him*, and not *Immediately* from *Christ*. You cannot want Capacity to understand a thing so plain, as both *Bellarmin* and *Salmasius* have made it: And I am not able to correct your *Will*, if you are resolved to be *Wilful*: All therefore I shall do, shall be, to pray to God that you may be willing to acknowledge and embrace Truth when it is presented to you on the Margin.

MUCH more might have been said, Gentlemen, in Vindication of our Principles; to shew, that they are so far from being any way subservient to the *Papacy*, that they are quite *Inconsistent* with it, and *Destructive* of it: But I think I have sufficiently answered my Design; which was, to let the People see, that our Principles are most unjustly represented by you to them: And to let your selves see, that, hereafter, ye cannot, without incurring the Guilt of Notorious and Stubborn, as well as Unreasonable and Uncharitable Calumniators, insist on these your common Pleas I have now discussed. I have used these hard Words (as I have told you before) to awaken you; to oblige you with a Witness to look to your selves, and be careful of your Souls. Only one thing more let me tell you: I am deceived, if, having so fully shewn the Unreasonableness of these your Pleas against *D. Monro*, I have not Enervated all your Books which you have written against him. For indeed your Main Strength lies in these Ridiculous Charges of Popery. *Discite justitiam Moniti.*

CHAP. X.

Episcopacy was believed by St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries to be of Divine Right.

IN the *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, it was transiently affirmed, that, in the Days of *St. Cyprian*, *Episcopacy* was generally believed to be of *Divine Institution*; and that our Martyr did frequently Reason upon the Supposition of its being so (a). It is a vast Mistake (says G. R.) that Cyprian pleads (a) p. 26.

A Vindication of a Discourse Entituled,

pleadeth for the Divine Right of Episcopacy: He pleadeth for the Divine Authority of the Church and her Bishops, that is, Pastors; Not for a Divine Warrant for the Pretension of some of them above others. And he adds, that nothing can be more evident than the concurrent Testimonies of Antiquity against this Fancy (b). This is rough Language enough; and it is not very fair Dealing. For it was not affirmed, that St. Cyprian pleaded for the Divine Right of Episcopacy. He never had Occasion to plead for it: No Man denied it, no Man doubted of it, in his time. All that was affirmed, was, that he Reasoned upon the Supposition of it. But this is no great matter. And I am so far from being angry at the Severity of his Language, that on the contrary, I do very heartily thank him for giving me such Provocation to establish such a considerable Principle of the Cyprianic Age, which was neglected in my former Book: This Principle, That Episcopacy is of Divine Right.

§ II.

A PRINCIPLE of great Consequence, and well worth the Pains of proving it, if it can be clearly proved to have then obtained. For, considering what I have discoursed in the first Chapter of this Book, concerning the Advantages of that Age; particularly, the great Advantage of being so very near to the Apostolic Age, that those who then lived, might, very easily, and very certainly have known what Form of Government the Apostles left in those Churches, whose Constitution they lived to finish (c). This considered, I say, it must be obvious to any Man of Ordinary thinking, that it must be an Argument of mighty Weight against our Presbyterian Brethren, if it can be made to appear, that Episcopacy was then universally received, as of *Divine Right*. All things considered, it must be an Argument of so great Weight, that the obscure Discourses of *Jerom* and *Hilary*, the mistaken Compliment of *Augustin* to *Jerom*; the ambiguous Expressions of some lesser and latter Fathers; and the frequently unlearned, as well as always Byass'd Sentiments of the Popish Schoolmen; that all these, even in Conjunction, must be very *Light* when put in the *Ballance* with it. Let us therefore try, whether St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries believed the *Divine Right* of Episcopacy. And, I begin with our Martyr, with Evidences of whose Belief of the Divine Right

(c) See Chap. 1.
§ XXXV. &c.

Right of Episcopacy, it were easie to fill a Volume. But I shall only name a few of them. And,

1. NOTHING more evident from a great many things § III. already discountred, E, g. I have proved, that St. Cyprian believed Bishops as contradistinguished from and superiour to Presbyters, to be the *Apostles Successors* in the *Supreme Lower Ecclesiastical* (a) I have proved, that he believed that (a) CHAP. VI none could be a *Rightful Bishop* but he that could derive a § II. III. *Regular Succession* from the *Apostles* (e). I have proved, that he believed it to be of *Divine Right*, that there should be (e) CAP. VI. but *one Bishop* at once in a *City*. And that, by his Principles, § XIV. &c. all Schismatical Bishops, such as *Novatianus* and *Fortunatus*, &c. were *Usurpers*, contrary to *Divine Precept*, to *Divine Institution*, to *Divine Tradition*, &c. (f) I have proved, that (f) Ibid. he believed the Bishop to be *God's High Priest*, and the Epi- § XVII. scopal Office to be *God's High Priesthood*. (g) I have shewn, (g) CAP. VI that he did frequently reason from Texts of Scripture, for XXXIII. proving that subjection which was due to a Christian Bishop XXXIV. as being *God's High Priest* (b). I have proved, that he be- (b) Ibid. lieved that it was a *Divine Ordinance*, that the Bishop should be a *peerless Pastor* (i) and the *one Judge*, within his own (i) Ibid. *District* (k). Nay, that he believed that the Rules obser- § XXXVI. &c. ved in the Promotion, the Election and Ordination of Bi- (k) Ibid. § XLI. shops, in his time, were of *Divine Appointment* (l) All these &c. things, I say, I have already fully proved, (and perhaps (l) CAP. VII. § XLI. divers others) from each of which, (and much more from all laid together) it must necessarily follow, that he believed *Episcopacy* to be of *Divine Right*. It were easie to prove that this was his *Belief*, by many other Arguments. Particu- larly

2. HE believed, that there was a *special Hand of Providence* § IV. in the *Promotion* of Bishops to their *Chairs*: That they (m) St. Cyprian were set apart for their holy Function by *Divine Designa- Complaining tion*. So he believed concerning himself (m), and concern to his People of the Unduti- fulness of some of his Presbyters, &c. writes thus, Ep. 43. p. 81, 82. Hoc enim quorundam Presbyterorum Malignitas & Perfidia perfecit ne ad vos ante Diem Paschæ venire licuisset: dum Conjuratōnis suæ Memores, & antiqua illa contra EPISCOPATUM meum, imo contra Suffragium vestrum & DEI JUDICIUM venena retinentes, &c. And Ep. 59. p. 129. Writing to Cornelius concerning that same Schismatical and Rebellious Faction. He discourses thus, Neque enim aliunde Hæreses Obortæ sunt aut Nata sunt Schismata, quam inde quod SACERDOTI DEI non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus Sacerdos & ad tempus Judex vice Christi cogitatur: Cui si SECUNDUM MAGISTERIA DIVINA obtemperaret Fraternitas Univerſa, Nemo—post DIVINUM JUDICIUM, post Populi Suffragium, post Coepiscoporum consensum, Judicem se non jam Episcopi, sed DEI faceret, &c. And Ep. 66. ad Florentium Pupianum. He insists largely to the same purpose, Vide Supra. CAP. VI. § VII. ning

(n) Concerning ning *Cornelius* (n), and *Lucius* (o) and generally of all Catholic Bishops (p) I forbear, for brevity, to translate the Testimonies: You have them plain and peremptory on the p. 103. where, Margent. Indeed, if we may believe the Accounts of that thus, Venio Age; God did not only design the persons by secret and un- jam nunc P.C. observed Management; but, frequently by Miracle, by Ex- ad personam traordinary, External Interposition. So it was in the Case (Cornelii) Col- lege nostri, of Alexander, when advanced to the See of Jerusalem ut Cornelium (q), and Fabianus to the See of Rome (r); both St. Cyprian's Nobiscum ve- Contemporaries. Nay, whose seriously considers the Te- rius noveris — de DO stimonies on the Margent, will find little reason to doubt, MINI JUDI. that St. Cyprian meant some such thing, even concerning CIO QUI himself and *Cornelius*. Much more might have been said EPISCO- to this purpose. Again, PUMFECIT

—Quietus & Modestus (*Cornelius*) & æqualis esse consueverunt qui ad hunc LO- CUM DIVINITUS eliguntur, &c. And p. 104. — post Episcopatum non exam- bitum nec extortum sed de DEI QUI SACERDOTES FACIT VOLUNTATE Susceptum quanta in ipso Suscepto Episcopatu virtus? And Ep. 61. p. 144, 145. — tota Cordis nostri luce perspicimus Divinæ Majestatis SALUTARIA & SANCTA CONSILIA, unde illic (*Rome*) repentina persecutio nuper exorta sit; unde contra Ecclesiam Christi & Episcopum CORNELIUM beatum Martyrem, volque omnes se- cularis Potestas subito proruperit, ut ad confundendos Hæreticos — ostenderet Dominus quæ esset Ecclesia quis Episcopus ejus unus DIVINA ORDINATIONE DELECTUS.

(o) *Ibid. Init. Epist.* nuper gratulari sumus cum TE (*Lucium*) honore geminato in Ecclesiæ suæ administratione Confessorem pariter & SACERDOTE M CONSTITUIT DIVINA DIGNATIO.

(p) Quamquam sciam, T. F. Episcopos plurimos Ecclesiis Dominicis in toto mundo DIVINA DIGNATIONE Præpositos — Ep. 63. p. 148. Et rursus, non enim vin- imur quando offeruntur nobis meliora, sed instruimur — ut nos SACERDOTES DEI, & Ecclesiæ ejus de IPSIUS DIGNATIONE præpositi Ep. 71. ad Quintum. p. 195. talia passim occurrunt.

(q) *Euseb. H. E. Lib. VI. Cap. XI.*

(r) *Euseb. Lib. VI. Cap. XXIX.*

§ V.

3. HE insists as frequently on the *Divine Protection* and *Vindication* of faithful Bishops; how God has a special care of them; and shews them peculiar Favours. You have a

(s) Copious Specimen of such his Belief on the Margent (s), only one Episcoporum numerus quos — Domini TUTELA PROTEXIT, &c. Ep. 55. p. 102. Nonne inter Gloriosus Martandus (*Cornelius*) qui tantum temporis sedit, expectans Corporis sui Carnifice, & Tyranni Savientis ultores qui Cornelium adversus Edicta feralia resistentem invaderent — ? Etiamli Majestas DOMINI PROTEGENTIS & Bonitas SACERDOTE M quem FIERI VOLUIT factum quoque PROTEXIT. *Ibid.* p. 105.

remarkable

remarkable one there is which I shall translate, it is in Ep. 66 to *Pupianus*, where he tells that Schismatick, that he had a special Revelation from our Lord to this purpose, *He who believes not Christ making a Bishop, shall afterwards be forced to believe Christ vindicating a Bishop.* So that this is not so much St. Cyprian's, as Our Saviour's Testimony, immediately revealed from Heaven to our Martyr (†). Caterum quando Episcopus DEI AUXILIO in persecutione PROTEGITUR in Amphitheatro

DOMINICÆ DIGNATIONIS TESTIMONIO honoratus à quibusdam desperatis—impugnari videtur, apparet quis impugnet; non scilicet CHRISTUS qui SACERDOTES aut CONSTITUIT aut PROTEGIT sed—Christi Adversarius &c. Ep. 59 p. 130. & rursus—Nullus SACERDOS DEI—cujus non Humilitas & Infirmitas Vigore ac Robore DOMINI PROTEGENTIS animeretur. *Ibid.* p. 139.

Ut simul cum cæteris Collegis nostris stabiliter ac firmiter Administremus; atque ut Ecclesiæ Catholicæ pacem Concordiæ Unanimitate teneamus PERFICIET DIVINA DIGNATIO, ut Dominus qui SACERDOTES sibi in Ecclesiâ ELIGERE & CONSTITUERE DIGNATUR, Electos quoque & Constitutos sua Voluntate atq; Opitulatione TUEATUR. Ep. 48. p. 91.

Vide plura, Ep. 43. p. 82. 84. Ep. 50. init. Ep. 51. init. Ep. 61. p. 144. & passim.

(†) Memini enim quod jam mihi sit OSTENSUM (*vocabulum Revelationibus denotandis nostro familiarissimum*) imo quid servo obsequenti & timenti de Dominica & Divina Auctoritate præceptum, qui inter cætera quæ OSTENDERE & REVELARE Dignatus est, & hoc addidit, ITAQUE QUI CHRISTO NON CREDIT SACERDOTEM FACIENTI, POSTEA CREDERE INCIPIET SACERDOTEM VINDICANTI. Ep. 66. p. 169.

THE Result of what hath been said is this: The Arguments contain'd in Sect. III. are clearer than to need any farther Illustration or Application. And these two last Considerations do as forcibly conclude, that St. Cyprian believed *Episcopacy* to be of *Divine Right*. Is it imaginable, that a Person of so penetrating a Reason as St. Cyprian, having his Wits about him, could have believed, that God would have so carefully and constantly interposed with a Providence peculiarly favourable, and extraordinarily manifested, to design the best of Men for, and protect and vindicate them in, the Administration of an Office which he had not Instituted? Had St. Cyprian been of the Modern Belief (the Belief professed by G. R. and his Brethren *Scottish Presbyterians*) that *Prelacy* is so very ill a thing: a Branch of *Antichristianism*; the *Mystery of Iniquity*; a Plant which God never planted in his Vineyard, a meer Usurpation; a Government simply unlawful, &c. Had it been possible for him to believe, that God would have so much regarded and befriended *Prelates*? But this is not all, For

A Vindiction of a Discourse, Entituled,

4. THE last Testimony I adduced, introduces me to another Consideration of as great weight as any of the former: It is, That as that Age abounded with *Signal Manifestations* and *Singular Operations* of the Spirit; with *extraordinary Revelations* of the Divine Will; so these were most frequently and commonly exhibited to *Bishops* for their *Direction* and *Encouragement* in the *Administration* of their Office. Whoso, with a suitable Attention, shall read over our Martyr's Epistles and Discourses, may find a great Multitude of such *Manifestations*. I shall only direct my Reader how to find a competent Number. Thus, he had a special Command from God to retire in the Days of the *Decian Persecution*. So he says himself (u), so it is likewise affirmed by his Deacon *Pontius* (v). Many such *Revelations* he had in that his Retirement. He accounts for 4 or 5 of them in his Eleventh Epistle, directed to his Presbyters and Deacons (w). In his time (the time of his Episcopacy) a Pestilence raged in *Carthage*: The People began to murmur and repine: This gave occasion to his writing his excellent Discourse on *Mortality*; wherein he not only condemns the Repinings of the People, but assures them, he had a Revelation, commanding him, assiduously to preach to them, and tell them, that they ought not to bewail their Brethren, whom God, by that Pestilence, called to himself, and liberated from the Miseries of this present Life (x). And when the Lapsers turn'd so Insolent, as to attempt, in a manner, to force him to give them Peace and Absolve them; he got frequent Admonitions from Heaven to maintain the Vigour of Discipline, and Oblige those Lapsers to complete their Satisfaction (y). And Ep. 63. He tells *Cacilius*, that it was in Obedience to an *Extraordinary Admonition*, that he wrote against that Error which he encounters in that Epistle (z). He tells his Clergy and People, Ep. 40. that it was in Compliance with a *Special Manifestation* of the Will of God, that he sent *Numidicus* to be added to the Number of his Presbyters at *Carthage* (a). It was particularly reveal'd to him, Ep. 58. that another Persecution was at hand (b). And Ep. 66. he tells *Florentinus Pupianus*, that he will not grant him his Communion, till he has first received some special Signification of the Will of God about it (c).

NEITHER

NEITHER were these Honours peculiar to St. Cyprian. § VIII. As he had a *Special Command* for his Retirement, so had the great *Dionysius* his Contemporary, Bishop of *Alexandria* (d). (d) Euseb. II. This extraordinary Man had likewise an *Extraordinary Revelation*, allowing, or rather, encouraging him to read all Heretical Writings, that he might the more effectually refute them (e). And not only St. Cyprian, but other 40 Bishops (e) *ibid. Lib. VII. Cap. VII.* with him do declare, in a Synodical Epistle, that they had *Received a Revelation from God*, that another Persecution was *approaching*; And therefore, having such Assurance of it, they had Unanimously *Resolved to shorten the Penances of the Lapsers*; and *restore them to the Churches Peace*; that they might *receive the Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood*, and be *Arm'd and Encouraged thereby*, the more resolutely to stand their Ground when the Persecution should come upon them (f).

(f) Cum videamus diem

rursus alterius Infestationis appropinquare cepisse, & CREBRIS atque ASSIDUIS OSTENSIONIBUS admoneamur ut ad certamen armati & parati simus.—Ep. 57. p. 116. & paulo post, *ibid.* p. 117. Obtemperandum est namque OSTENSIONIBUS atque ADMONITIONIBUS. &c. & p. 119. placuit nobis, SANCTO SPIRITU SUGGERENTE & Domino per VISIONES MULTAS & MANIFESTAS, admonente, quia Hostis nobis imminere PRÆNUNCIATUR & OSTENDITUR; colligere intra Castra Milites Christi, &c.

THE Consequence of this Consideration is every whit as § IX. Firm and Necessary as of any of the former: For, if St. Cyprian (and the same may be said of *Dionysius* and the other 40 Bishops) had not believed *Episcopacy* to have been a *Divine Ordinance* (at least, as to *Approbation*) how could he so readily have believed, that God would have Honoured, Enlightened, Directed, and, by Visions, and extraordinary Manifestations of his Purposes and Pleasure, Encouraged those who exercised the Episcopal Office? How could he have believed it any manner of way, agreeable to the most Intelligible and Comprehensible Attributes of God; his Wisdom, I mean, his Honour, his Purity, his absolute Sovereignty and Independency, to concern himself so Signally and Extraordinarily for the good Success of Government in the Hands of such Sacrilegious and Abominable Liars as these must needs be, who pretend to have *Commission* from him when they have none? Of such notorious *Usurpers* as acted, not only *without* his *Commission*, but in *plain Contradiction* to his *Ordinance*; if it was his *Ordinance*, that the *Church* should be *Govern'd by Pastors*

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

acting in Parity, according to the Presbyterian Principles?
And,

§ X.

AS this Argument is strong and nervous in itself, so, it is of a peculiar Force against our Presbyterian Brethren, upon such Principles as themselves value very highly, and insist on very confidently: With what Keeness and Confidence have some of them insisted on this Argument for Presbytery, that God has so frequently and observably honoured its most zealous Abettors with *Special Manifestations* of his Spirit, and *Revelations* of his Will and Purposes? How much is this insisted on in the Book, called, *the Fulfilling of the Scriptures*? What else than this pretence to such *Communications* has so much recommended Mr. Rutherford's Letters? Now, I say, seeing our Presbyterian Brethren are so apt to use and insist on such Reasonings, upon what Ground can they reject Reasonings founded upon the same Principles? Upon the *Communications* of God's Mind, and the *Revelations* of his Purposes in the *Cyprianic Age*? Will they say, that such Reasonings cannot be Good or Solid? Why then do they use them? will they say, that themselves reason well in this matter, because they have a *Good Cause*; but St Cyprian and his Contemporaries reasoned wrong, because it was for the Assertions of a *Bad Cause* their *Manifestations* were pretended? I am hopeful they will not venture on such a ridiculous Plea, such a notorious Tergiversation; for this is palpably to make the *Affertion* justify the *Argument*, and not the *Argument* the *Affertion*.

§ XI.

EVIDENT, then, it is, that we have (if not much better, yet at least) as good reason to argue from the *Manifestations* in St. Cyprian's time, as our Brethren can pretend to for arguing from the *Manifestations* made to those of their Party. Well! Where there are *Equal Pretences* to *Extraordinary Revelations*, and Arguments drawn from them by the Opposite Pretenders to prove Opposite and Contradictory Conclusions; one thing is certain, namely, that 'tis impossible that both Pretences can be good, till it turn possible to reconcile Contradictions. It must needs therefore remain, that the Pretensions on both sides to *Extraordinary Revelations*, be carefully and impartially examined and compared; and that Tryal be made, whether Pretensions have greatest Probability: Whether Manifestations are most likely to have been

been really and truly of God: And let our Brethren bring it to this Question whenever they please. And yet after all,

T H O' I do not in the least doubt, that St. *Cyprian* and his Contemporaries had really those *Manifestations* they pretended to, yet it is not absolutely necessary for my present purpose, that they had them really: It is enough that they *believed* they had them: And their so plain and positive Asserting that they had them, is the best Argument the Nature of the thing is capable of, to prove, that they *believed* they had them: But if they did really *believe* they had them, and had them for their *Direction* and *Encouragement* in the *Administration* of the *Episcopal Office*; it must needs follow, that they likewise *believed* Episcopacy to have *Divine Approbation*: It must needs follow, that they did not *believe* as our Presbyterian Brethren profess to *believe*; that they did not *believe* Episcopacy to be unlawful: On the contrary, nothing more smoothly colligible from such their *Belief*, than that likewise they *believed* Episcopacy to have been a *Divine Ordinance*. But neither is this all: I have yet many more Arguments to prove, that St. *Cyprian* believed the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*: But for Brevity I shall only insist on other Three.

5. THEN, if he believed, that it was a Transgression of the Laws of God, a departing from the Gospel, a notorious dishonouring of God, and a Crime that brought down God's Judgements; when any Ecclesiastical Subjects, Presbyters or others disobeyed, contemned, separated from, or rebelled against their Bishops; it seems to follow unavoidably, that he believed *Episcopacy* to be a *Divine Ordinance*: Now, that he believed these things, is so obvious in his Writings, that to collect all that is contain'd in them to this purpose would be as troublesome as it is needless. How frequently doth he make Contemners of, or Separaters from, or Rebels against their Bishops, guilty of the Crime, and obnoxious to the Punishment of *Core*, *Dathan* and *Abiron*? But this, and many other such Arguments of his *Belief* in this matter have been already pursued in the preceding Chapters. I shall only give three or four plain Testimonies on the Margent (g). Indeed,

(g) Quodenim nonpericulum metuere debemus de Offensa Domini quando aliqui de Presbyteris nec EVANGELII nec Loci sui Memores, sed neque FUTURUM Domini JUDICIUM, neque nunc sibi præpositum Episcopum cogitantes—cun Contumelia & CONTEMPTU

TEMPTU PRÆPOSITI totum sibi vendicent. Ep. 16. p. 36. & ibid. p. 38. Hi (Presbyteri)—CONTEMPTA DOMINI LEGE & Observatione——ante reditum nostrum——communicent cum Lapsis, &c.

Audio tamen quosdam de Presbyteris nec EVANGELII MEMORES,—nec Episcopo honorem Sacerdotii sui & Cathedræ reservantes, &c. Ep. 17. p. 39.

Honor ergo datur Deo quando sic Dei Majestas & Censura contemnitur ut cum se ille indignari & irasci Sacrificantibus dicat, & cum pœnas æternas & Supplicia perpetua comminetur: Proponatur à Sacrilegis atque dicatur; ne ira cogitetur Dei, ne timeatur Judicium Domini, ne pulsetur ad Ecclesiam Christi; sed sublata Poenitentia, nec ulla exomologesi Criminis facta DESPECTIS EPISCOPIS atque CALCATIS PAX à PRESBYTERIS verbis fallacibus prædicetur? Ep. 59. p. 135.

And in his discourse De Lapsis, he makes the Contempt of the Bishops, one of the Provocations which brought down the Judgement of the Persecution. p. 123.

§ XIV.

6. St. CYPRIAN was so much persuaded of the Divine Right of Episcopacy, that he frequently insults on the Devil's Malice and Hatred against the Bishops, as being God's High-Priests; and Administering an Office of Divine Institution.

(b) — Ap-
paret quis
impugnet (se, nempe suumque Episcopatum) non scilicet Christus qui SACERDOTES aut CONSTITUIT aut PROTEGIT, sed ILLE qui Christi Adversarius & Ecclesiæ ejus Inimicus, ad hoc Ecclesiæ præpositum sua Infestatione persequitur, ut Gubernatore sublato atrocius & violentius circa Ecclesiæ Naufragia grassetur. Cyp. ad Cornel. Ep. 59. p. 130.

Agnoscitne jam qui sit SACERDOS DEI? quæ sit Ecclesiæ & Domus Christi? qui sint Dei Servi quos DIABOLUS INFESTET? qui sint Christiani quos Antichristus impugnet? Neque enim quærit illos quos jam subegit; aut Gestit evertere, quos jam suos fecit. Inimicus & Hostis Ecclesiæ quos alienavit ab Ecclesiâ & Foras duxit, ut Captivos & Vincitos contemnit & præterit: eos pergit lacerare, in quibus Christum cernit habitare. Ad eundem Cornelium. Ep. 60. p. 142, 143.

Intelligimus F. C. (Lucium alloquitur: De Cornelio & Novatiano, uter nempe Romanus ex Dei Ordinatione esset Episcopus, sermo est) Quis Episcopus ejus (Domini nostri) unus DIVINA ORDINATIONE delectus; qui cum Episcopo Presbyteri Sacerdotali honore conjuncti; quis adunatus & verus Christi Populus Dominici gregis caritate connexus: Qui essent quos INIMICUS laceraret, qui contra, quibus DIABOLUS ut suis parceret. Neque enim persequitur & impugnat Christi Adversarius nisi Castra & Milites Christi, &c. Ep. 61. p. 144, 145.

Persecutio enim veniens te ad summam Martyrii sublimitatem provexit me autem Proscriptionis onere depreffit, cum publice legeretur; si quis tenet vel possidet de Bonis Cæcili Cypriani Episcopi Christianorum; ut etiam qui non credebant DEO EPISCOPIUM CONSTITUENTI, vel DIABOLO crederent EPISCOPIUM PROSCRIBENTI. Ad Papiam Ep. 66. p. 166.

Vide plura Ep. 43. p. 84. Ep. 55. p. 103, 105. Ep. 59. p. 126.

§ XV.

7. OUR Blessed Martyr, I cannot tell how often, doth in most plain direct and peremptory terms affirm Episcopacy to be of Divine Institution. I begin with Ep. 33, because I did mention it in my former Book; And G. R. is very angry that

that I should have affirmed, that St. Cyprian did Reason on such a Supposition in it. I have already told, how some of the Lapsers, encouraged thereto by some over-keen Martyrs and Confessors, and some discontented Presbyters, had written to St. Cyprian, then, in his Retirement, calling themselves a Church, and requiring him to restore them to his Communion. This 33d Epistle contains his Answer to them. The main Conclusion he aims at in it, is, that it was an unaccountable Presumption in them, (being in the State of Excommunicates, not having finished their Penances, not yet restored to the Churches peace by the Bishop, who had the Sovereign Power of Reconciliation, &c.) thus to call themselves a Church &c. Now, that we may clearly and distinctly perceive the Principles from whence he draws this Conclusion, I will once more translate and transcribe his Reasoning. It runs to this Purpose: *Our Lord, whose commands we ought to dread and obey, instituting the Honour of a Bishop and the Order of the Church, says thus to Peter in the Gospel: I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it: And I will give to thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth shall be loosed in Heaven. From hence, by the turns of Times and Succession, the Ordination of Bishops, and the Order (Frame, Contexture or Constitution) of a Church is so hanged down, as that the Church is built upon the Bishops; and all the Administration (or Government) of the Church is managed by the same Rulers (the Bishops): Seeing, therefore, this is founded in the Divine Law, it is marvellous to me, that, with such a bold Temerity, some of you (Lapsers) should have thus written to me in the Name of a Church; whereas, a Church consists of a Bishop, and Clergy, and Faithful or Unlapsing Christians. God forbid that ever the Pity and the Power of Our Lord should suffer such a Reproach, as that a Number of Lapsers should be called a Church (i).* So I render it in such Scottish as I have: But let the stress lie on the Original as you have it on the Margent.

Honorem & Ecclesiae suae rationem disponens, in Evangelio dicit Petro, Ego tibi dico, quia tu es Petrus, & super istam Petram Edificabo Ecclesiam meam, & Portae Inferorum non vincent eam; & tibi dabo Claves Regni Caelorum, & quae ligaveris super terram erunt ligata in Caelis; & quaecunque solveris super terram erant soluta & in Caelis. Inde per Temporum & Successionum vices, Episcoporum Ordinatio & Ecclesiae

(i) Dominus
noster, cujus
Præcepta me-
mora & ob-
servare debe-
mus, Episcopi

clesiæ. Ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesiæ super Episcopos constituantur; & omnis actus Ecclesiæ per EOSDEM PRÆPOSITOS Gubernetur. Cum hoc itaque DIVINA LEGE fundatum sit, Miror quosdam audaci temeritate sic mihi scribere voluisse, ut Ecclesiæ nomine Literas facerent; quando Ecclesiæ in EPISCOPO & CLERO & in omnibus STANTIBUS sic CONSTITUTA. Absit enim ne Domini Misericordia & potestas ejus invidiam pariat, ut Ecclesiæ esse dicatur Lapsorum Numerus, cum scriptum sit, Deus non est Mortuorum sed Vivorum. Ep. 33 p. 66.

§ XVI.

(k) Prin. Cyp.
Age. p. 21.

BY the way: If I have varied in words from my former Translation (k); it is not for any Force there is in G. R.'s Censure of it; but to try, if using other words to express the same thing, will please him. His Censure he might indeed have spared without any Diminution of his Credit. It is, that *I shew but little Skill in translating those words* [omnis Actus Ecclesiæ per EOSDEM PRÆPOSITOS gubernetur] *into these* [All her Affairs are ordered by them (Bishops) as the chief Rulers] why little Skill shewn in this Translation? Because, forsooth, the Sentence should be turn'd [*By the same who are set over her*]. And I think (says G. R.) *it will not be denied, that Presbyters are Præpositi* (l). n, truly: But I am apt to think, not in this place: the Relative Pronoun [Eosdem] as I take it (as every School-boy will, at first sight, take it) refers only to the Bishops mentioned before: And I think before, there was no mention of Presbyters. Bishops, then, and Bishops only were the *Præpositi* meant by St. Cyprian in this place: And I can refer it to any impartial Judge, to determine, whether in this work I have not sufficiently proved, that Bishops were *Præpositi*, Rulers in chief. But this as I said, only by the way: proceed we now to our chief Business: viz.

§ XVII.

TO consider what the Principles were from which St. Cyprian drew his aforesaid Conclusion. And, in short, these, at least, are most manifestly contain'd in his Reasoning. 1. That our Lord, when he said to Peter, *Ego tibi dabo*, &c. did not only institute the *Ratio*, the Order, the Frame, the Contexture of a Church, but likewise the *Honour*, that is, as I have shewn (m), the Power, the Authority, the Sovereignty of a Bishop. The design of the whole Reasoning, here, necessarily requires, that we should so understand the Term *Honour*. 2. That in Pursuance of that Institution or Disposition, or Settlement, or Ordinance, there had always, to that very day, been a *Succession* of such Bishops. 3. That (according to our Lord's Promise to St. Peter) all particular

(m) CAP. V.
§ X.

Particular Churches had always been *built* on their Particular Bishops. 4. That those Particular Bishops had always ordered the Discipline, managed the Government, tempered the Administration of those Particular Churches. That therefore, 5. By Divine Precept, which all ought to honour and obey, the Power of those Particular Bishops ought to be regarded and acknowledged by all the Members of these Particular Churches whereof they are Bishops. These Principles are so brightly contain'd in our Martyr's Reasoning, that I am hopeful, G. R. himself will acknowledge so much when he seriously considers it; and acknowledge withal, that St. Cyprian believed the *Divine Institution* of Episcopacy.

BUT if he shall make such Acknowledgments, then I hope that he will likewise retract his two surprising Observes on this Reasoning of St. Cyprian's (n). The one is, *that a Bishop is not a Church*; concerning which, before (a). The other is that when St. Cyprian says, the Church is founded on the Bishop, his meaning is, *It is founded upon his sound Doctrine*: as if the sound Doctrine of the meanest Member of the Church, were not as sound as the sound Doctrine of the Bishop: The plain truth is, G. R. might as well have mention'd the Bishop's *Doublet* as his *Doctrine*: For however necessary it may be (and who denies it to be most necessary?) that the Bishop's Doctrine should be sound; yet St. Cyprian, in the Reasoning we have now before us, was no more immediatly and directly concern'd in the Bishop's *Doctrine* than his *Doublet*. The Bishop's Sovereign Power of Government and Discipline was all he aim'd or could aim at in the present Argument; as is demonstratively evident from the Scope and *Series* of the Epistle.

NEITHER is it in this 33d Epistle only that he insists on this Reasoning from our Lord's words to Peter, for the *Divine Right* of Episcopacy. He has it over again in his 73d. Epistle, to *Jubaianus*, as hath already been accounted (p). He has it likewise in his excellent Discourse of the *Unity of the Church*; where, his Design is to shew the horrid Impiety of rebelling against the duely and canonically Elected and Ordain'd and Orthodox Bishop of any Particular Church; or separating from him; or setting up as an Anti-bishop in Opposition to him: And his first and

chiefest Argument is that which hath been already insisted on, viz. that our Lord founded his Church on St. Peter, and thereby instituted Episcopal Government; and laid an Indispensable Obligation on all the Members of every Particular Church to maintain *One Communion*, by living in a dutiful Subjection to and Dependance on the *one Bishop*, who to his own Particular Church is the *Principle of Unity*. The Reasoning is so full, that it is too long to be transcribed; indeed it is needless to transcribe it, for you have already the Substance of it transcribed from Ep. 33. only one thing I observe about it, namely, the Assurance wherewith our Martyr addresses to it: He brings it in with an Air, importing, that it is both an obvious and unconquerable Argument (q). This same Reasoning for the *Divine Institution*

(q) Hoc (2^a) *Ecclesiam scindit* of Episcopacy, he either implies or supposes in divers di) ex eo fit other Places. Such as Ep. 43 (r). and Ep. 66. (s): and F. D. dum ad not only he, but other 30 Bishops with him (t): you have Veritatis originem non reditur, nec caput quaeritur nec Magistri Coelestis Doctrina servatur. Quæ si quis consideret & examinet tractatu Longo & Argumentis non opus est. Probatio est ad fidem facilis compendio veritatis. Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum. Ego tibi dico, &c. —super unum ædificat Ecclesiam suam, &c. Vide *De Unit. Eccl.* p. 105, 106, 107, 108, &c.

Deus unus est, & Christus unus, & una Ecclesia & CATEDRA UNA super Petrum Domini voce fundata, &c. Ep. 43. p. 83.

(s) Dominus quoque in Evangelio — Conversus ad duodecim dixit; Nunquid & vos vultis ire? Respondit ei Petrus — Domine ad quem ibimus? — loquitur illic Petrus, super quem ædificata fuerat Ecclesia, Ecclesiæ Nomine docens & Ostendens quia etsi Contumax ac Superba Obaudire Nolentium Multitudo discedat, Ecclesia tamen à Christo non recedit; & illi sint Ecclesia Plebs Sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo Grex adhærens: Unde scire debes Episcopum in Ecclesia esse & Ecclesiam in Episcopopo, &c. Ep. 66. p. 168.

(t) — Baptisma unum — & Spiritus Sanctus unus & una Ecclesia à Christo Domino super PETRUM origine Unitatis & Ratione fundata. Ep. 70. p. 191.

§ XX.

OUR holy Martyr in very many other places directly and positively asserts the *Divine Right* of Episcopacy: I shall name a few. In his Address to *Fortunatus*, prefixed to his Discourse *De Exhort. Martyrii*, he says expressly, that *the People are by GOD COMMITTED to the Bishop's Care* (u). He says in his Discourse at the opening up of the

(u) Quid autem potius aut majus Curæ ac Sollicitudini nostræ congruit; quam ut COMMISSUM nobis DIVINITUS Populum, & Exercitum in Castris Coelestibus constitutum, adversus Diaboli tela & jacula exhortationibus assiduis præparemus? *De Exhort. Martyr.* p. 167.

great.

great Council of Carthage, An. 256. That our Lord Jesus Christ, and he alone, has power offsetting Bishops over the Church to govern it; and he alone can judge of their Administrations

(v). He says to Cornelius, Ep. 59. that if the Courage of Bishops be shaken, and they shall yield to the Temerity of wicked Schismaticks; there will then be an End of the Episcopal Authority, and the Sublime and DIVINE POWER of governing the Church (w). And again, in that same Epistle (as we have heard already) that Christ CONSTITUTES

as well as protects Bishops. And Ep. 66. to Florentius Pupianus, that 'tis GOD that MAKES BISHOPS: This he tells him twice or thrice over (x), and that his People was committed to him by the DIVINE FAVOUR (y). And that 'tis by the DIVINE APPOINTMENT

that a Bishop is set over the Church (z). And what can be clearer, plainer, or more positive, than what he says to Pompeius, when he tells him it is indispensably requir'd of Bishops, that they fear God; that they maintain the Faith;

that they observe Christ's Precepts; that they preserve the Sanctity of Christ's Spouse uncorrupted and inviolated, &c. and all this because they are bound as God's Faithful Soldiers, to watch over the Camp, BY GOD COMMITTED to them, with a courageous Fidelity (a): And again, It is our Duty who are the PRIESTS of GOD (or Bishops) as we would be deem'd Obedient to the Divine Precepts, when any Corruption has crept into the Church, to reform it according to our Lord's Institution, &c. that thence our Administration may take it's Rise, whence our Order had it's Original (b).

CERDOTES ejus in Ecclesia CONSTITUANTUR? Qui non credebant Deo Episcopum CONSTITUENTI—Episcopus homo Dignatione DEI honoratus—annue aliquando (Pupiane) & dignare pronunciare de nobis (me n. Cypriano) & Episcopatum nostrum Cognitionis tuæ Auctoritate firmare, ut Deus & Christus ejus agere tibi gratias possint quod per te sit Antistes & Rector, altari eorum pariter & Plebi restitutus—Quare in hunc Scrupulum non inciderunt de Plebe ista nostra quæ apud nos est & nobis de DEI DIG-

NATIONE COMMISSA est?—Quamobrem, Frater, si Majestatem Dei qui SASERDOTES ORDINAT Cogitaveris—Ep. 66. (z) Apeshabent Regem & Ducem pecudes & fidem servant Latrones—PRÆPOSITUS illic agnoscitur & timetur quem non SENTENTIA DIVINA CONSTITUIT, sed in quem factio perdita & nocens Caterva consensit. Ibid. p. 167.

(a) Quod si est apud nos F. D. Dei timor, si tenor prævalet fidei, si custodimus Christi Præcepta, si incorruptam atque inviolatam Sponsæ ejus Sanctitatem tuemur—quasi fideles Dei Milites qui Deo Fide & Religione sincera militamus COMMIS-

SA NOBIS DIVINITUS CASTRA fideli Virtute servemus, Ep. 74. p. 214. 215. U u u 2 Quod

(v) Expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi qui unus & solus habet

Potestatem & PRÆPONENDI NOS (Episcopos) in Ecclesiæ suæ Gubernatione & de Actu nostro judicandi. Tom. i. p. 230.

(w) Vide Supra. CAP. V. & VI.

(x)—Post Deum Judicem qui SACERDOTES FACIT.

Quid est credere quod non à Deo nec per Deum S A.

(b) Quod & nunc facere oportet DEI SACERDOTES, Præcepta divina servantes, ut si in aliquo Nutaverit & Vacillaverit Veritas; ad ORIGINEM Dominicam & Evangelicam & Apostolicam Traditionem revertamur; & inde surgat ACTUS nostri ratio unde & ORDO & ORIGO SURREXIT: *Ibid.* p. 215, 216.

§ XXI.

NOTHING had been easier, than to have adduced twice so many Evidences, from St. Cyprian's Writings, of his *Belief*, of the *Divine Right* of Episcopal Government: But methinks, I have given that which is sufficient; as much, I am confident, as may convince even G. R. himself, that it was Rashness in him to say, that it was a *vast Mistake*, to say, that St. Cyprian *Argued upon the Supposition of Episcopacy's being of Divine Institution*. I proceed now, to try what was the *Faith* of his Contemporaries. And because G. R. has somewhere insinuated, that St. Cyprian, being a Bishop, might have been *Partial*, and made some *Stretches* for procuring Veneration and Submission to his *Order*, the first of his Contemporaries, I shall name, shall be *One* who was never more than a *Presbyter*.

§ XXII.

(c) Cap. VIII.

§ XI.

ORIGEN is the Man: How much he was St. Cyprian's Contemporary I have shewn before (c). I am now to shew, that he *deposes* plainly for the *divine Right* of *Pre-lacy*. He does it in his Commentaries on St. Matthew, he produces Texts of Scriptures, not only against the second Marriages of Deacons and of Presbyters; but also, of Bishops, as contradistinguished from the other Orders: Peculiar Texts of Scripture, I mean, besides those, he adduces against the second Marriages of the other two Orders. And in the same Commentaries, he says, that St. Paul defining what Bishops ought to be, says, *They must not be Litigious nor Strikers, but meek and of good Behaviour*; having all those good Qualifications, which those Stewards ought to have whom *our Lord sets over his Family*; as St. Luke has it. And in his 13th. Homily on St. Luke: *If it be proper* (says he) *to speak boldly the meaning of the Scriptures, in every Church there are two Bishops, the one Visible, the other Invisible*. His meaning is, that besides the *Visible Bishop*, such as Demetrius, or Heraclius or Dionysius were, in his time, in *Alexandria*; there was likewise a *Guardian Angel* set apart for the *Episcopacy* of every particular Church: But that which I am concern'd for, at present

sent, is only that *Origen* believed, that both these Bishops were to be found in Scripture. So that, already, we have had three plain Testimonies from him, for the Divine Right of Episcopacy. But we have yet more: For,

IN his 20th. Homily on *St. Luke*, If *Jesus Christ the Son of God* (says he) is subject to *Joseph and Mary*, shall not I be subject to the Bishop, who is of God ORDAIN'D to be my Father? shall not I be subject to the Presbyter who by the Divine Vouchsafement is set over me? Here the Bishop as contradistinguish'd from the Presbyter is positively said to be ordain'd of God: To be sure, he has as much of Divine Right as the Presbyter. If G. R. shall come in here with his old *Mumpsimus* of the SOLE POWER, who can help it? I go on with *Origen*, who in his Commentaries on *St. Matthew*, interpreting these words of *St. Luke*, And he that is chief, as he that serveth; he understands it to be a Precept concerning the Office of a Bishop. And in his second Homily on the *Canticles*, he finds a Prophetick Vision, concerning the three Ecclesiastical Orders of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon. And in his third Book against *Celsus*, he again takes it for granted, that *St. Paul* 1 *Tim.* 3. describes a proper Bishop as contradistinguish'd from a Presbyter. Now, it will be nothing to the purpose, to say, that *Origen* mistook *St. Paul*. My Argument cannot be infirm'd, but by saying that he mistook his own Belief; (which to say would be a little surprizing) for here it lyes: He who understood *St. Paul* of a Prelate, could not but believe the Divine Right of Prelacy. Once more, the same *Origen* in his Book about Prayer, discoursing of the Debts mention'd in our Lord's Prayer, after he has insisted on the Duties common to all Christians, he adds, besides these more common or universal Debts, there is a Debt peculiar to such as are Widows maintain'd by the Church: And there is a Debt peculiar to Deacons; and another peculiar to Presbyters: But of all these peculiar Debts, that which is due by the Bishop is the greatest: It is exacted by the Saviour of the whole Church; and the Bishop must smart severely for it, if it is not paid. In which Testimony, we have *Origen's* Belief of the Divine Right of Episcopacy most plainly supposed: For how can the Saviour of the whole Church, require any thing as a Debt of any person, on whom he, by his Laws, has laid no Obligation to pay it?

How

Origen (as *Eusebius* H. E. L. VI. C. XXV. has recorded) in the 5th of his Commentaries on *St. John*, has the same Sentiment which *St. Cyprian* and *Fermilian* have about the Churches being built on *St. Peter*, and by Consequence it is not to be doubted, that (as well as they) he lookt on that as a Divine Institution of Episcopacy.

How could he bind a Bishop to such and such performances, and make them a Debt due by one invested in that Office, if he never instituted such an Office? He might indeed have punish'd him for usurping such an Office, even without, much more against, his Institution: But without Institution, it will be very hard to shew, how an exaction of a conscientious discharge of the Office of a Bishop, as of a Debt, can be comprehended. And so much for *Origen*. I have not been at the pains to transcribe his own words; because, to tell truth, not having his works at hand, I have taken these Citations from another: But such another as may be most securely trusted; I mean the admirable *D. Pearson* in his *Vind. of Ignatius's Epistles* Part. I. CAP. XI. whither I can boldly refer, *G. R.* or any Man for my Fidelity. I do not at present remember, of any more Contemporaries *St. Cyprian* had in *Egypt*, of whose Writings any thing is extant, except *Dionysius*, for whom I have already accounted (d), having shewn that God honoured him with *Extraordinary Revelations &c.* Wherefore,

(d) § VIII.

§ XXIV.

LET us return to *Africa*, and try if there we can find any more Witnesses deposing for the *Divine Right* of Prelacy. And indeed, nothing plainer than the *Suffrages of Fortunatus à Thuchabari* (e) and *Confessor Venantius à Tinisa* (f), who says expressly, that our Lord left the care of his Spouse to the Bishops: And *Confessor Clarus à Muscula* (g), in the often-mentioned Council of *Carthage*, holden *An. 256*. It is farther colligible from divers other *Suffrages* of that venerable Council, when taken by the right Handle. It is not to be doubted, but it was the common Belief of all the *LXXXVII* Bishops. For 'tis most reasonable to believe all the rest were of the same Faith with *St. Cyprian* their *Præses*, and those other Three just now named. And that so much the more, when it is considered, that it is clearly attested by divers other *African Synods* (convocated in that Age) as appears from their *Synodical Epistles*. Thus,

§ XXV.

THAT which is the 57th among *St. Cyprian's*, is a *Synodical Epistle* written by 40 Bishops, besides, *St. Cyprian*, *An. 252*. And therein we have as clear an account of their Faith as can be desired: They look upon themselves as *Christ's Lieutenant-Generals*, as it were, having *Commission* from
Heaven,

Heaven, to Arm and Animate his Souldiers, under their Command (b): And, as the *Pastors to whom the Sheep are entrusted by the chief Shepherd* (i). The 61st. seems to have been another Synodical Epistle, Congratulatory, upon *Lucius's* Return to the See of Rome: And there we have Bishops of *Divine Ordination* (k). The 67th Epistle is ordered by XXXVII Bishops met in Synod, and giving their Resolution of the Case proposed to them, concerning *Martialis* and *Basilides*, two Lapsing Spanish Bishops. Now the *Divine Right* of Episcopacy runs through the whole Series of this Epistle. They call the Episcopal Office, *Sacerdotium Dei*, God's Priesthood; and they (as all of those times) were very far from thinking, that Men, of their own Heads, might erect a *Priesthood* to God. They affirm, that God's Law doth not allow, that *Basilides* and *Martialis* should any longer hold their Bishopricks: They say, that *God's Law allows none to be Bishops, but such as are without Blemish and Men of Integrity*: They say, that by the *Divine Law*, the People are bound to separate from Lapsing Bishops: They affirm most plainly, that it descends from *Divine Authority*, that a Bishop should be chosen in the Presence of the People. And particularly, concerning *Martialis*, they prove from *Tit. 1. 7.* that he can no longer hold a Bishoprick (l). The Seventieth is another Synodical Epistle, sign'd by XXXII Bishops, wherein Episcopacy is not only fairly founded on our Saviour's Discourse to *St. Peter* (m), the Argument so frequently insisted on by *St. Cyprian*; as hath been observed; but also it is expressly affirmed by them, that it was by the *Divine Vouchsafement that they administrated Gods Priesthood in his Church* (n). Another Synodical Epistle there

(b) -- Plebem etiam nobis divina dignatione commissam exhortationibus nostris paremus, & omnes omnino milites Christi, qui Arma desiderant & prælium flagitant intra Castra Dominica colligamus
Ep. 57. p. 117.
(i) Nonne nobis vel Negligentia segnis, vel duritia crudelis adscribetur in die judicii quod PASTORES CREDITAS & COMMISAS NOBIS OVES nec curare in Pace, nec in Acie voluerimus

Armare? Ibid. p. 118. & rursus p. 119. Ne igitur — OVES NOBIS COMMISSÆ à DOMINO reposcantur, placuit nobis S. Spiritu suggerente, &c.

(k) Vide Supra, § IV.

(l) — Basilidem & Martialem libellis Idololatriæ Commaculatos — Episcopatum gerere & SACERDOTIUM DEI administrare non oportere, Ep. 67. p. 170. Quin potius, totam Epistolam legat Eruditus Lector.

(m) — Una Ecclesia à Christo Domino super PETRUM, Origine Unitatis & Ratione fundata — Ep. 70. p. 191.

(n) Quare qui cum Domino sumus, & Unitatem Dei tenemus, & secundum ejus DIGNATIONEM SACERDOTIUM EJUS administramus, quæcunque Adversarii ejus & Antichristi faciunt repudiare & rejicere & pro profanis habere debemus — Ibid. 192.

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

is, the 72^d in number, written to *Stephen, Bishop of Rome*, wherein it is expressly affirmed that the Episcopal Authority is

(o) — Quod magis pertinet & ad SACERDO- TALEM is to Counteract a *Divine Ordinance* (p): Than which, what plainer Demonstration can be desired of their *Belief* of the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*?

VINE DISPOSITIONIS ORDINATIONE venientem. — Ep. 72. p. 196.

(p) Addimus plane & adjungimus — Consensu & Auctoritate communis ut etiam si qui Presbyteri aut Diaconi, qui vel in Ecclesia Catholica prius Ordinari fuerint, & postmodum Perfidi & Rebelles contra Ecclesiam fuerint; vel apud Hetericos à Pseudo Episcopis & Antichristis CONTRA CHRISTI DISPOSITIONEM, profana ordinationi promoti sint & contra ALTARE UNUM atque DIVINUM sacrificia foris falsa ac Sacrilegia offerre conati sint, &c. *Ibid.* p. 197.

§ XXVI.

THAT those in whose names these Synodical Epistles were written were *Bishops* in a proper Sense; *Bishops* as Contradistinguished from, and Superiour to Presbyters, has been fully demonstrated above, when it is proved, that none but *Bishops* had *Definitive Voices* in Synods. And by what I have now represented, you may see how unanimously they do all agree in the *Belief* of their having their *Commission* from *Heaven*, and that their *Office* was of *Divine Appointment*. Take them all together, and they make a goodly Number of Witnesses giving in very clear Depositions. We have their Names who were convoked in those Synods which wrote Ep. 57. 67. and 70. (according to *Pamelinus's* numbers, 54. 68. 70.) prefixed to these Epistles. I have compared them, and found more than LX different *Bishops* of them. It seems credible from *St. Cyprian's* Epistle to *Jubaianus*, that there were LXXI in that Synod which wrote Ep. 72. to *Stephen Bishop of Rome*. There were LXXXVII (as has been frequently observed) in the great Synod *Au. 256*. May we not, without exceeding the Bounds of a modest Computation, reckon upon an hundred Witnesses in *Africa*, when all those Synods are laid together?

§ XXVII.

CROSS we now the *Mid-land Sea*, to try if we have any Friends in *Europe*. But whither shall we go when we are there? To *Rome*, without scruple, To *Rome* Orthodox and Uncorrupted: To *Rome* whose *Bishops*, in those days, were holy Martyrs and Confessors, standing on a Level with other

other Bishops; owning all other Bishops to be their Colleagues; professing the Christian Faith in great Purity, and Suffering for it: As great Strangers to *Purgatory* and *Transubstantiation*, and the *Worshipping of Images*, &c. as to *Propagating* or *Defending Religion* by *Arms*, or the *Deposing Principles*. And now that we are there, let us begin with the Noble Testimony of those *Roman Confessors* who had once joyn'd with *Novatianus* in his *Schism*, but afterwards return'd to the true Communion; and submitted to *Cornelius* as Rightful Bishop of *Rome*. *Cornelius* (sufficiently assured of their Sincerity, and of their Fixed Resolution thereafter, to be dutiful) convokes the *Presbytery*; and the Returners are brought in, and make (no doubt, after serious Deliberation and Premeditation) this fair and clear Profession of their Faith as to the Interests of Episcopacy. We know (or we acknowledge) that *Cornelius* is CHOSEN BISHOP of this most Holy Catholic Church (the particular Church of *Rome*) by the OMNIPOTENT GOD, and by OUR LORD CHRIST, We confess our Error: We have been impos'd upon: We have been abused by Treachery, and ensnaring Talk. For we are not ignorant that there is ONE GOD, and ONE LORD CHRIST, whom we have confessed; and ONE HOLY GHOST; and that there OUGHT TO BE ONE BISHOP in a Catholic Church (q). Here, you see, 'tis most plainly professed that *Cornelius* had a Divine Warrant to be Bishop of *Rome*. He was CHOSEN by the GOD OF ALL POWER, and by the LORD CHRIST. Doth not this import, at least, that he was promoted to the Chair according to the Will of God; and the Rules laid down by Christ and his Apostles? I say, at least; for it may be fairly understood to import more: viz. that he was promoted by Special and Extraordinary Designation: Nay, is it not notoriously imported in this Profession, that there was the same Divine Authority for Believing that there OUGHT to be but ONE BISHOP in one particular Church that there was for Believing that there is One God, One Lord Christ, and One Holy Ghost? Is not this their reasoning exactly of a Piece, to the same Purpose, and upon the same Principles with that of St. Cyprian's, which we had before, from Ep. 43. viz. that there is One God, One Christ, One Church, and One Chair, by our Lord's Voice founded on St. Peter; Another Altar, besides the ONE ALTAR cannot be reared: mus, UNUM SP. SANCTUM UNUM EPISCOPUM in Catholica Ecclesia esse DEBERE. Ep. 49. p. 93.

(q) Nos
Cornelium
E P I S C O -
P U M sanctif-
icæ Catholi-
cæ Ecclesiæ,
ELECTUM
à DEO OM-
NIPOTEN-
TE & CHRI-
STO DOMI-
N O N O-
STRO scimus.
Nos Errorem
nostrum con-
fitemur nos.
Imposturam
passi sumus.
Circumventi
sumus perfidia
& Loquacitate
Capiosa:
Nam etsi vi-
debamur quasi
quandam
communicati-
onem cum
Schismatico
& Hæretico
Homine habu-
isse; sincera
tamen mens
nostra semper
in Ecclesia fuit.
Nec enim
Ignoramus
U N U M
DEUM esse,
U N U M
CHRISTUM
esse DOMI-
N U M quem
confessi su-
mus.

(r) DEUS *Another Priesthood, besides the* ONE PRIESTHOOD, cannot UNUS est, *be created* (r) ? But this is not all.

& CHR. STUS UNUS, & UNA ECCLESIA, & CATHEDRA UNA SUPER PETRUM DOMINI VOCE FUNDATA. ALIUD ALTARE constitui aut SACERDOTIUM NOVUM fieri præter UNUM ALTARE & UNUM SACERDOTIUM non potest. Ep. 43. p. 83.

§ XXVIII.

IF we consider Circumstances, and regard fair Consequences, we must needs acknowledge, that this was no less the Belief of *Cornelius*, and the *Five Bishops* who were present, and all the *Presbyters* and *Clergy*; Nay, of all the *Great Concourse of the Fraternity*: All before whom the Profession was made, return'd Thanks to God for it. They did all, with Tears, express the Joy of their Hearts when they heard it: They did all most chearfully embrace the Returners that made it: With all speed that same very Hour, (says *Cornelius*) the glad Tidings were dispatch'd to *St. Cyprian*, that with all Expedition, he, his *Clergy*, his *People*, nay all the Churches of *Africa* might render solemn Thanks to Almighty God and our

(s) Ep. 49. p. 93.

(t) Ep. 51.

Lord for it (s), which was accordingly done (t). But how can it be imagined, that *Cornelius* and all the rest of those at *Rome*, with so great Joy, with so many Tears, with such a ready Chearfulness, with so much Unanimity, would have expressed their Satisfaction with such a Confession, if they had not believed it to be *Orthodox*? If they had not believed that to be of *Divine Right*, which was so positively affirmed by it to be so? Indeed,

§ XXIX.

THAT it was *Cornelius's* Belief, we have full Assurance from his own Epistles that are extant. We have him reasoning to the same very purpose, and on the same very Principles, against the same *Novatians* whom the aforesaid Confessors renounced; this, I say, we have in one of his Epistles written to *Fabius Bishop of Antioch*, as it is recorded by *Eusebius* (u), where he says expressly, that *Novatianus* usurped, and by Force, seiz'd the Bishoprick when it was not given him from above (v): Which may indeed, import more (viz. that

(u) Euseb. H.E. Lib. VI. Cap.

43.

(v) Οὐτως

ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς

αὐτῷ ἐν

ἐκείνῳ

ἔτι

ἔτι

ἔτι

ἔτι

ἔτι

ἔτι

ἔτι

ἔτι

ἔτι

ἔτι

he wanted extraordinary divine Designation, so common in those times) but cannot import less, than that his Usurpa-

tion was not of Divine Right, but of human Power, and that he was not called to the Bishoprick by the voice of the Lord, but by the voice of men.

ANNOEN Επισκοπῆς ἁγίας, &c.

tion

tion was therefore culpable, because it is contrary to the Wisdom which is from above w. The Gospel Laws concerning the Succession of Bishops. And what less than the Divine Right of Episcopacy can be implied in that severe Irony, in that same Epistle? *The Vindicator of the Gospel doth not know that there ought to be but one Bishop in a Church?* What less can be implied, I say, in this Irony, than that Novatianus was a Vindicator of the Gospel, very little skilled in the Laws of the Gospel (as some Vindicators of the Kirk, are in the Monuments of the Church) seeing he did not know, that by these Laws there could be only *One Bishop at Once* in a Church (x)? And, 'tis plain, 'twas on the same Principles, and proceeded from the same Belief, that the same Cornelius, in an Epistle to St. Cyprian, says of the same Novatianus, viz. that he was *Prostratus Virtutibus Dei* (y), that God appear'd his Enemy remarkably, and in Signal Instances of Vengeance, for his so very barefacedly affronting the Divine Ordinance concerning the Regular Succession of Bishops.

NOR is the Faith of the Roman Presbyters and Deacons, less evident, as appears from Two Epistles written by them to St. Cyprian, during the Interval between the Death of Fabianus, and the Promotion of Cornelius. In the one, having given their Sentiment about the Case of the Lapsed, and told how far they had proceeded in that matter, they say they can proceed no farther, till GOD SHALL GIVE THEM A BISHOP (x). In the other, their Belief of the Divine Right of Prelacy, is more than once fairly intimated. They tell St. Cyprian, how much his Vigour and his Severity so exactly agreeable to the EVANGELICAL DISCIPLINE, in the Administration of his Episcopacy, comforted them amidst their great Pressures (a). I have told before (b), how the Cyprian Confessors behaved concerning the Lapsed, and what an Insolent Epistle they wrote to St. Cyprian about that matter. That which I do now observe is, that the Roman Clergy do plainly pronounce it inconsistent with the LAWS of the GOSPEL, that Confessors should make such Encroachments on the Bishops Prerogative (c). And as for the Lapsed, they

causa teneatur. Ep. 30. p. 60.

(a) Mœtoris nostri tam gravem Sarcinam Vigor tuus & secundum EVANGELICAM DISCIPLINAM adhibita Severitas temperat. Ep. 36. p. 69.

Supra Cap. VII. § LX.

(c) Quod si aliunde Prærogativam Communicationis habere se credunt, cum EVANGELIO illam conferre conentur, ut ita demum firmiter valeat si ab EVAN-

GELICA say, their best Course would be to excite the Clemency if God
 LEGE non by Submission; and allure the Divine Mercy by giving DUE
 dissonat. Cæ- HONOUR or Obedience to GOD's PRIEST, the
 terum quo- Bishop (d) indeed, nothing more certain, as already hath
 pacto EVAN- been observed (e), than that in that Age, it was universal-
 GELICAM: ly and incontestably received, all the world over, that the
 poterit præ- Bishops of Rome were St. Peter's Successors. So that, to sup-
 stare commu- pose any Roman to have doubted of the Divine Right of
 nicationem Episcopacy, is to suppose them to have doubted of that which
 quod contra EVANGELICAM by as obvious, as necessary consequence, followed from that
 decretum vi- which they did believe to be most certain.

tem? Ep. 36. p. 70. Hoc utique volunt (ut ex totius Epistolæ filo pater) nulla quali-
 cunque sive Confessorum, sive Presbyterorum auctoritate posse, per Evangelium,
 Pacem Lapsis, renuente vel invito Episcopo concedi.

(d) Tempus igitur est ut agant (Lapsi) delicti pœnitentiam, ut probent Lapsus sui
 dolorem, & ostendant verecundiam, ut monstrent Humilitatem, ut exhibeant Mo-
 destiam, ut de Submissione provocent in se DEI Clementiam & de HONORE
 DEBITO IN DEI SACERDOTE (vel Sacerdotem) eliciant in se DIVINAM MISE-
 RICORDIAM Ep. 36. p. 71. Pamel. Ep. 30.

(e) Supra Cap. VI § XII. XIII.

§ XXXI.

THUS have we found the Divine Right of Episcopacy to
 have been believed in Africa and Europe: Go we next to
 Asia. 'Tis true, our Witnesses, there, are not many; on-
 ly two, but these two as good as two hundred. Alexander
 and Firmilian are the Men, the one, Bishop of Jerusalem;
 the other, of Casarea in Cappadocia. We have already ob-
 served how, by extraordinary and miraculous Designation,
 Alexander himself was promoted to that Bishoprick: There
 were two or three special Revelations about it. It was the
 οὐνορροια Θεοῦ, Gods special care for his Church that did it,
 there was τι Θεοῦ μυστήριον in it; something peculiar to God,
 a Divine Oracle, in the matter, as we learn from Eusebius.

(f) See Euseb.
 H. E. C. X. XI.

(f). This, Alexander himself knew very well, and was per-
 swaded of: And not only so, but when, upon the Death
 of Serapion, Asclepiades, a noble Confessor was promoted
 to the Chair of Antioch; Alexander wrote an Epistle to the
 Church of Antioch, congratulating their Happiness, and
 telling them, that his Bonds turn'd light and easy to him, when
 he heard that such an excellent and fit person was made their
 Bishop καὶ ἡ διακονία αὐτοῦ, by the special Favour of God

(g) Ibid. C. XI.

(g). Such was Alexander's Belief, so was he per-
 swaded

ded concerning *Episcopal Promotions*. How then could he doubt of *Episcopacy's* being a *Divine Ordinance*? And truly, as has been observed before (b), easily might he have known, (b) *Supra Cap.* and well might he have been assured what Government was settled by the Apostles. Though he lived to be St. *Cyprian's* Contemporary, though he outlived by some Years St. *Cyprian's* Promotion to the See of *Carthage*: Yet it was about the Year 212, that he was made Helper to *Narcissus* in the See of *Jerusalem*: to *Narcissus*, I say, Aged then 116 Years, and by Consequence, Born before the Death of St. *John* the Apostle.

COME we now to *Firmilian*: And here my Courage may seem a little surprising to G. R.'s Disciples: For G. R. hath said in express Terms, that *Firmilian* doth fully declare for *Presbyterial Government* (i): And my Task is to prove, that he believ'd *Episcopacy* to be of *Divine Institution*. Here is Opposition wide enough. Let us therefore proceed deliberately, and make two distinct Enquiries in this matter. 1. Whether *Firmilian* doth fully declare for *Presbyterian Government*? and 2. Whether he declares for the *Divine Right of Prelacy*? Begin we with the first, (i) § 37 p. 49.

I. WHETHER *Firmilian* declares fully for *Presbyterial Government*? One thing I am confident of, in the first place; Namely, that there are strong Presumptions against G. R.'s side of this Question. Every man of common Ingenuity, I think, after he has compar'd G. R.'s *Cyprianick Bishop examined*, with *The Principles of the Cyprianick Age*, and this *Vindication* of them, will readily confess, that the Government of the Church in that Age, was notoriously Prelatical. But if it was so, and if it was so, so much upon the supposition that *Episcopacy* was of *Divine Right*, as I have hitherto proved it was; then certainly, it is not very credible, that any particular person of that Age was against those common Principles. It is not at all to be supposed, unless his *Declarations* against them be so very plain and peremptory, that without manifest Force and Violence, they cannot be reconciled to the common and received Principles. Let us therefore try what they are, which G. R. calls *Firmilian's full declarations for Presbytery*. They are two.

THE first is, that *Firmilian* hath these words. *Qua ex re necessario apud nos fit, ut per singulos Annos, Seniores et* *Præ-*

GELICA say, their best Course would be to excite the Clemency if God
 LEGE non by Submission; and allure the Divine Mercy by giving DUE
 dissonat. Cæ- HONOUR or Obedience to GOD'S PRIEST, the
 terum quo- BISHOP (d) indeed, nothing more certain, as already hath
 pacto EVAN- been observed (e), than that in that Age, it was universal
 GELICAM- ly and incontestedly received, all the world over, that the
 poterit præ- Bishops of Rome were St. Peter's Successors. So that, to sup-
 stare commu- pose any Roman to have doubted of the Divine Right of
 nicationem Episcopacy, is to suppose them to have doubted of that which
 quod contra- by as obvious, as necessary consequence, followed from that
 EVANGE- which they did believe to be most certain.
 LICAM- decretum vi-
 detur verita-

tem? Ep. 36. p. 70. Hoc utique volunt (ut ex totius Epistolæ filo pater) nulla quali-
 cunque sive Confessorum, sive Presbyterorum auctoritate posse, per Evangelium,
 Pacem Lapsis, renuente vel invito Episcopo concedi.

(d) Tempus igitur est ut agant (Lapsi) delicti pœnitentiam, ut probent Lapsus sui
 dolorem, & ostendant verecundiam, ut monstrent Humilitatem, ut exhibeant Mo-
 destiam, ut de Submissione provocent in se DEI Clementiam & de HONORE
 DEBITO IN DEI SACERDOTE (vel Sacerdotem) eliciant in se DIVINAM MISE-
 RICORDIAM Ep. 36. p. 71. Pamel. Ep. 30.

(e) Supra Cap. VI § XII. XIII.

§ XXXI.

THUS have we found the Divine Right of Episcopacy to
 have been believed in Africa and Europe: Go we next to
 Asia. 'Tis true, our Witnesses, there, are not many; on-
 ly two, but these two as good as two hundred. Alexander
 and Firmilian are the Men, the one, Bishop of Jerusalem;
 the other, of Casarea in Cappadocia. We have already ob-
 served how, by extraordinary and miraculous Designation,
 Alexander himself was promoted to that Bishoprick: There
 were two or three special Revelations about it. It was the
 οὐνοποία Θεοῦ, Gods special care for his Church that did it,
 there was τι Θεοεισμον in it; something peculiar to God,
 a Divine Oracle, in the matter, as we learn from Eusebius.
 (f) This, Alexander himself knew very well, and was per-
 swaded of: And not only so, but when, upon the Death
 of Serapion, Asclepiades, a noble Confessor was promoted
 to the Chair of Antioch; Alexander wrote an Epistle to the
 Church of Antioch, congratulating their Happiness, and
 telling them, that his Bonds turn'd light and easy to him, when
 he heard that such an excellent and fit person was made their
 Bishop καὶ τὸ δεῖον ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ, by the special Favour of God
 (g). Such was Alexander's Belief, so was he perswa-
 ded

(f) See Euseb.
 H. E. C. X. XI.

(g) Ibid. C. XI.

ded concerning *Episcopal Promotions*. How then could he doubt of *Episcopacy's* being a *Divine Ordinance*? And truly, as has been observed before (b), easily might he have known, (b) *SupraCap.* and well might he have been assured what Government was settled by the Apostles. Though he lived to be *St. Cyprian's* Contemporary, though he outlived by some Years *St. Cyprian's* Promotion to the *See of Carthage*: Yet it was about the Year 212, that he was made Helper to *Narcissus* in the *See of Jerusalem*: to *Narcissus*, I say, Aged then 116 Years, and by Consequence, Born before the Death of *St. John the Apostle*. *§ XLVI.*

COME we now to *Firmilian*: And here my Courage may seem a little surprising to *G. R's* Disciples: For *G. R.* hath said in exprefs Terms, that *Firmilian* doth fully declare for *Presbyterial Government* (i): And my Task is to prove, that he believ'd *Episcopacy* to be of *Divine Institution*. Here is Opposition wide enough. Let us therefore proceed deliberately, and make two distinct Enquiries in this matter. 1. Whether *Firmilian* doth fully declare for *Presbyterian Government*? and 2. Whether he declares for the *Divine Right of Prelacy*? Begin we with the first, (i) § 37 p.49.

I. WHETHER *Firmilian* declares fully for *Presbyterial Government*? One thing I am confident of, in the first place; Namely, that there are strong Presumptions against *G. R's* side of this Question. Every man of common Ingenuity, I think, after he has compar'd *G. R's* *Cyprianick Bishop examined*, with *The Principles of the Cyprianick Age*, and this *Vindication* of them, will readily confess, that the Government of the Church in that Age, was notoriously Prelatical. But if it was so, and if it was so, so much upon the supposition that *Episcopacy* was of *Divine Right*, as I have hitherto proved it was; then certainly, it is not very credible, that any particular person of that Age was against those common Principles. It is not at all to be supposed, unless his *Declarations* against them be so very plain and peremptory, that without manifest Force and Violence, they cannot be reconciled to the common and received Principles. Let us therefore try what they are, which *G. R.* calls *Firmilian's* full declarations for *Presbytery*. They are two.

THE first is, that *Firmilian* hath these words. *Qua ex re, necessario apud nos fit, ut per singulos Annos, Seniores et Pra-*

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

Præpositi in unum conveniamus, ad disponenda ea quæ coram nobis commissa sunt, ut si quis ratio iuxta, conveniant Consilio dirigitur. "That is, For which cause, we find it necessary "with us, that once every year, we Seniors and Rulers should "meet together, to order those things that are committed "to our care, and if there are any matters of great consequence, to determine them with common Advice. I wish G. R. had told us where he laid the Stress of his Argument, that he pretends to be in these words. But seeing he has not; let us enquire: Is it that those *Seniores* and *Præpositi* did meet in Synods? but there may be other Synods besides Presbyterian ones. Is it that they met to order Matters &c.? Why might not Synods of Bishops have been convoked for that end too? Is it that they met every year? This looks more like to a *Provincial Synod of Bishops*, than to the meeting of a *Presbytery*: Is it that *Firmilian* called those who met in those yearly Synods, *Seniores* and *Præpositi*? But doth not G. R. acknowledge, we have only a *Translation* of *Firmilian's* Epistle, how then does he know, but the words in the *Original* might have given us more clear and distinct *Idea's* of the Characters of those who met in these Synods, than these words *Seniores* and *Præpositi* can afford us? Nay, suppose the words in the *Original* to have been *presbyters* and *episcopos*; with what certainty can G. R. infer thence, that those who met were no other than *Presbyters* in the *Presbyterian* sense? What if these two Terms signified Men of two different Orders? G. R. acknowledges *Pamelinus* understood them so: Nor has so much as attempted to render it incredible. He has indeed drawn a most surprizing Inference, from *Pamelinus's* taking *Seniores* to signify *Presbyters*, and *Præpositi*, *Bishops*; as has been already observed (k). But what needs more? Have I not fully and distinctly accounted for the Constitution of *Provincial Synods*, in the days of *Firmilian*? Have I not demonstratively shewn, that Bishops and none but Bishops; Bishops properly so called, Bishops as contradicting distinguished from, and superior to *Presbyters*, had *Decisive voices* in them? Nay, have I not particularly accounted for that very *Synod of Iconium* which *Firmilian* mentions? and made it clear as Light, that it was a *Synod of Bishops* (l)?

(k) Supra Cap.
VII. § XXVII.

(l) Supra Cap.
VII. § XII.
&c. N. B.
§ XIX.

NEITHER is G. R. happier in his other Argument, to
prove

prove that *Firmilian* was a *Presbyterian*; it is taken from the words of the Father: *Omnis Potestas & Gratia in Ecclesia est constituta, ubi praesident Majores natu* (*πρεσβύτεροι*, says G. R.) *qui & baptizandi, & Manum imponendi & ordinandi possident Potestatem*. This Testimony, I say, is as far as the former, from being a full Declaration for *Presbyterian Government*: For 1. As confident as G. R. is in asserting that *πρεσβύτεροι* was *Firmilian's* Term, which *St. Cyprian* (or whoever was the Translator) turn'd into *Majores Natu*. Yet, were he put to it, I doubt, it would trouble him to prove it. There are divers other Greek Words which might have been so translated. *Polycrates*, I remember, in his famous Epistle recorded by *Eusebius* (m), uses the word *Μαζορες*. And *Gregorius Thaumaturgus*, in his Canonical Epistle, calls *Εν* (m) H. E. Lib. 5. Cap. XXV. *πρεσβυτερος*, who probably was one of his Presbyters, not *Συγγρηγο*, but *Συγγρηγο*, his, fellow Senior: † So that, 'tis † Canon V. possible, *Firmilian's* word was *Γεροντες*. Nor is it without Reason to affirm, that 'tis more probable it was one of these two, or perhaps some third rather than *πρεσβύτεροι*: For if *St. Cyprian* was the Translator, his Master *Tertullian's* word, *Seniores*, had probably sooner occurred to him to have rendered *πρεσβύτεροι* by: This is certain, it had been more proper and significant than *Majores Natu*; a Term divers times used indeed by *St. Cyprian*, but never so much as once to denote one that had the Character of a single Presbyter. Whenever was the Translator, it seems propable that *Firmilian's* word was not *πρεσβύτεροι*, from this, that the word *Presbyteri* is kept in the Latin, where 'tis certain that the Greek word was *πρεσβύτεροι*. Thus, where the account is given of the False Prophets that cheated many at *Caesarea*; it runs thus [*Hic & unum de Presbyteris rusticum, item & alium Diaconum sefellit* (n): But not to spend time need- (n) Epist. Firm. p. 222. lessly about such Conjectures. Say that it was the word *πρεσβύτεροι*, what can G. R. or his Cause gain by it? who knows not that this word in those earlier times, was frequently taken in a *Laxer* sense, as well as in the *Stricter*; But if so, then, the Latin will very naturally bear, to be turn'd thus into Scottish, *no Hereticks who have cut themselves off from the Church of God can have any Power or Grace, seeing all Power and Grace is confined to the Church, in which, (such Elders do preside as have the Power of Baptism, of imposing the*

A Vindication of a Discourse Entituled,

Hand, and Ordination. And that the Bishops as making a distinct Order from Presbyters, had the *Sovereign Power* of Baptism, Im-

(s) Supra Cap. VI § LI. l. &c. *posing the Hand, and Ordination,* is not now to be proved (s). Bishops then as contradistinguished from Presbyters, were *Firmilian's Majores Natu.* Indeed nothing more evident than this, from the Account of the Synod of *Iconium*, immediately subjoin'd, as has been already considered (p). Now though what hath been said might be enough to shew, that *Firmilian* has made no full *Declarations* for *Presbyterial Government*; yet it is not all. For,

§ XXXVI.

DO TH not *Firmilian* more than once, in express Terms declare himself to be of the same Principle, in every thing, with *St. Cyprian*, who, I think, has made pretty full *Declarations* for *Prelatical Government* (q)? Doth he not give us an Account (as I have already hinted) of a False Prophetess that ensnared (besides many other People) one of the *Presbyters* and one of the *Deacons* of *Casarea*, where himself was *Bishop*? And doth not this import, that there were more *Presbyters* than one in that City? But if there were more *Presbyters*, and only one *Bishop*: If by the unquestionable Principles of that Age, whatever might have been the number of *Presbyters*, yet, there could not be more than one *Bishop* at once in one City: If by all the Monuments of that Age (as we shall see by and by) *Firmilian* was certainly the one *Bishop* in that City, wherein there were many *Presbyters*; then, let any man judge, whether *Firmilian*, when he mentions one of the *Presbyters* of that City, does

(q) Gratias propter hoc maximas Domino egimus quod — hic Spiritu adunemur, quasi non unam tantum regionem, tenentes, sed in ipsa atque in eadem domo simul habitantes.

Ep. 75. p. 217. Cum magna lætitia exultavimus & gratias egimus quia invenimus in fratribus tam longe positis tantam nobiscum fidei & Veritatis Unanimitatem p. 218.

not by irresistible consequence declare that the Government of the Church in that City, was of the same *Form*, with the Government of other Churches in that Age? i. e. a Government undoubtedly *Prelatical*. Again, doth he not most fairly imply, that the Government of the Churches in the *East*, where he lived, was of the same Constitution with the Government of the Churches of the *West* and *South*, where it was notoriously *Prelatical*? Doth he not most fairly imply this, I say, when he is chastizing *Stephen Bishop* of *Rome* for his Schismatical Temper, his unreasonable heats, his humane Rudenesses to those Bishops who were sent as Legates to him by the Bishops of the *African Churches*? Doth he not there speak of Bishops, in the common Dialect? in the very same Dialect in which *St. Cyprian* and all his other

Contemporaries spake, when they spake of Bishops as contradistinguish'd from Presbyters? Consider what you have on the Margent (r) once more, doth he not most clearly distinguish Bishops from all other Clergy men in the very conclusion of his Epistle (s)? Indeed,

(r) Excidisti enim teipsum (Stephanum intelligit) Noli

te fallere. Siquidem ille est vere Schismaticus qui se à Communione Ecclesiasticæ Unitatis Apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes à te ABSTINERI posse, solum te ab omnibus ABSTINUISTI (Abstinit igitur sive Excommunicavit Stephanus Episcopus de Baptismo Hæreticorum à se dissentienter) — Quid enim humiliter aut levius (ironicè hæc) quam cum tot EPISCOPIS per totum Mundum discessisse, pacem cum singulis vario discordiæ genere rumpentem, modo cum Orientalibus (quod nec vos (Africanos) latere confidimus) modo vobiscum qui in Meridie estis? A quibus legatos EPISCOPOS patienter satis & leniter suscepit, ut eos nec ad Sermonem saltem colloquii communis admitteret: adhuc insuper Dilectionis & Caritatis memor, præceperet fraternitati universæ ne quis eos in domum suam reciperet; ut venientibus non solum Pax & Communio, sed & rectum & hospitium negaretur p. 228

(s) Bene te valere omnibus nobis, cum Universis qui in Africa sint EPISCOPIS, & cunctis Clericis, & omni fraternitate Universi optamus. p. 229.

F E W Persons lived in that Age, of whom it is more copiously recorded that they were Bishops, than Firmilian, Eusebius says of him, that, at what time Origen went to those parts, Firmilian Bishop of Casarea of the Cappadocians (Δέσπotes) made a singular Figure (t). He reckons him as much, (t) L.VI.c.26 and as properly a Bishop, as Xystus was of Rome, or Deme- trianus of Antioch, or Domnus of Casarea in Palestine, or Hymenæus of Jerusalem, &c. Nay, Dionysius Bishop of Alex- andria, one of Firmilian's Contemporaries, in an Epistle recorded by Eusebius (v), reckons him amongst the (v) L.VII.c.V *ἐπίσκοποι* 'Επίσκοποι the most Illustrious Bishops of that Age, and as much a proper Bishop, as any of the rest who there he names. Again, Eusebius accounting for that Synod that was convoca- ted in Antioch, to enquire into the Heresie of Paulus Samosa- tenus, not only tells, that Firmilianus, Gregorius, Athenodo- rus, Helenus, Nicomas, Hymenæus, Theotecnus and Maximus, Δέσπotes, were the most remarkable Bishops that were there, but he expressly distinguishes the Bishops, from the Presbyters and Deacons (w). And not Eusebius only, but the next Sy- nod which met in that place, upon that same account, in their Synodical Epistle, do most plainly distinguish the Three Orders; and withal, as plainly determine Firmilian, by name, to have been as much the One Bishop of Casarea in Cappadocia, as Dionysius was of Alexandria (x). And no Man that weighs things as they ought to be weighed, but will readily acknow- ledge

(w) L. VII. C. XXVIII.

(x) Euseb. L. VII. C. XXX.

ledge, that it was as to an eminent Bishop in those parts, that St. Cyprian wrote to him the Epistle, to which he is an answer.

§ XXXVIII.

MUCH more might have been said, but let even these things be laid together, the Common Principles and Universal Practice of that Age, whereby the Government of Churches was notoriously Prelatical: The no Evidence of Firmilian's being for Presbyterian Parity: The great Evidences in his Epistle that he declared for Prelacy: And the Unanimous and Consistent Accounts of Eusebius, Dionysius, nay of a whole Synod of his Contemporaries, bearing Witness that he was a most notable Bishop; a Bishop of a singular Authority and singular Accomplishments; Bishop of Caesarea of Cappadocia, a famous City, in which there was a famous Church, which required the Subordinate Labours of many Presbyters: Lay these things together. I say, and then judge with what reason G. R. could say, that Firmilian did fully declare for Presbyterian Government. Proceed we now,

§ XXXIX.

2. TO our other Enquiry, viz. whether Firmilian has declared for the Divine Right of Episcopacy? An Enquiry which is indeed fully determined already; particularly, where it is proved, that Firmilian, upon the same Principles with St. Cyprian, has positively declared his Belief to have been, that Bishops were Successors to the Apostles in the Supreme Power Ecclesiastical: That he plainly founded the Episcopal Order on our Lord's Words to St. Peter: And that he fairly allowed Stephen as Bishop of Rome, to have sat in St. Peter's Chair, &c.

(y) See above
Cap. VI. § IX.
X. XI. XII.
XIII.

(y) And certainly his Faith in this matter might be collected from divers other Intimations in his Epistle. I shall instance only in one. After he has most severely and briskly chastised Stephen, Bishop of Rome, (as has been already intimated) for his unbrotherly Behaviour towards such of his Collegues as dissented from him; he concludes with affirming, that such his Behaviour was [*contra Sacramentum & Fidem*] against God's Ordinance, and the Laws of Christianity (z), from which the Consequence is so obvious, that to name it is enough

(z) After what
you have

above § XXXVI. (y) it immediately follows thus, in Firmilian's Epistle. p. 228. Hoc est servasse Unitatem spiritus in conjunctione Pacis, abscindere se à Caritatis Unitate, & alienum se per omnia Fratribus (Episcopis) facere, & CONTRA SACRAMENTUM & FIDEM, contumacis furore discordia rebellare. Apud talem (qualis est Stephanus) potest esse unum Corpus & unus Spiritus, apud quem fortasse ipsa Anima una non est, sic Lubrica & Mobilis & Incerta?

viz.

viz. that *Firmilian* believed, that it was by *Divine Appointment*, that *All Bishops* were combin'd into *One College*, as well as *Obliged* to maintain *Unity*. *Firmilian* was no *Papist* indeed, as is plain from the whole *Series* of his *Epistle*: And by this time, methinks, 'tis as evident that he was no *Presbyterian*.

BEFORE I proceed farther, let me interpose one Caution: It is, that although I am very well satisfied, that St. Cyprian, *Firmilian* and whosoever else, in those days, reasoned from our Lord's Building his Church on St. Peter, &c. for the *Divine Institution* of *Episcopacy*, did reason solidly, and upon good and firm Principles, as hath been demonstrated most fully and clearly by the admirable Mr. Doawell, in his notable *Seventh Cyprianic Dissertation*; yet, if G. R. or any of his Brethren shall think fit to examine what I have said, they must not think they have done enough when they have rais'd Mist against such reasonings as were used by those Fathers for asserting the *Divine Institution* of *Episcopacy*. They must remember, I say, that our present Enquiry is, whether they believed such an *Institution*? And not, whether the Arguments were good which mov'd them to believe so. For who knows not that it is very ordinary for Men very firmly to believe, sometimes *Truth*, sometimes *Errors*, when yet, in the mean time, their Faith is founded on very *Insufficient Arguments*? This I thought fit to say for preventing of unnecessary Disputes. Return we now to our main Business.

ONE Witness remains yet to be examined, concerning whom we must follow the same Method which we took about *Firmilian*; that is, we must first purge him of *Presbyterianism*, and then try how he *deposes* concerning the *Divine Right* of *Prelacy*. Pontius is the Man: And G. R. says of him, that 'tis plain he thought all Degrees were included in *Sacerdotium* & *Presbyterium*, which he took for one (a). All Church Degrees! what? Did Pontius believe *Ruling Elders*, *Deacons*, *Subdeacons*, &c. to be *Priests*? but to go on with G. R. he will have it to appear from Pontius's account, that Cyprian was made *Priest*, *Presbyter* and *Bishop* all at once, as being the same thing (b). So G. R. has affirmed: Let us try with what Reason. In a word, with none at all, as I shall now shew, as briefly

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

as I can, I hope, even to G. R.'s Conviction. But let us proceed distinctly, And I say,

§ XLII.

THE first of G. R.'s Assertions is plainly founded upon a wrong Reading; G. R. reads thus, *Nulla mora, nulla dilatio, Presbyterium & Sacerdotem Statum accepit quis enim non omnes honorum gradus crederet tali menti?* Now, besides that, this is very coarse Latin, *Sacerdotium Statum accepit*: Unworthy of

(c) — Egre-
gum volumen
vitæ & passio-
nis Cypriani.
Hieron. Catal.

Pontius, who, if we may believe St. *Jerom* (c), wrote a choice *Volume of the Life and Passion of St. Cyprian*: Besides that, this reading makes very bad Sense of the whole Period; for why, subjoin *Quis enim non omnes Honorum gradus, &c.* If he was only promoted to *One Degree*? Besides these things, I say, G. R.'s reading was not to be found in any of all the more than Thirty Manuscripts, considered and compared by the Ingenuous, as well as Learned and Laborious D. *Fell*, before he published the Edition of St. *Cyprian's* Works which I make use of. All of them that have this Work of *Pontius's*, read thus. *Mora denique circa gratiam Dei nulla, nulla dilatio, parum dixi: Presbyterium & SACERDOTIUM STATIM accepit (or emerfit) Quis enim non omnes honorum gradus crederet tali mente credenti?* So *Blondel* likewise has it (d). By which reading it is not only plain, that the *Mora nulla*, and the *Dilatio nulla*, were *circa Gratiam Dei*; but also that *Pontius* very clearly distinguished between *Presbyterium* and *Sacerdotium*, which latter Term, in the Dialect of those times, was most frequently put for *Episcopatus*, as any Man may have observed, who has read from the beginning of this Book: So that *Pontius's* true meaning is most plain and obvious, viz. That St. *Cyprian*, a little after his Conversion, was made a *Presbyter*, and, shortly thereafter, a *Bishop*.

§ XLIII.

THAT this is the Genuine reading, must be evident to any who considers how naturally and sweetly it pieces with the next Words. *Quis enim non omnes honorum Gradus crederet tali mente credenti?* Who would not have given all the Degrees of Honour to such an excellent Believer? How appositely, I say, doth this follow upon an Enumeration of different Degrees of Honour, especial when *One* of them is the *Highest*? And how Senseless (as I have said) had it been, if the *Presbyterium* and the *Sacerdotium* had been but *One Degree*? This was the Sense St. *Jerom* understood *Pontius's*: For he most manifestly distinguishes between St. *Cyprian's* Ordination to be

be a *Presbyter*, and his Ordination to be a *Bishop* (e). So (1) Post non doth *Eusebius*, and *Cassiodorus* (f). And what can be plainer multum tem- in the History of those times, than that the same Person was poris, Electus promoted to these different Degrees of Honour, by different Or- in Presbyte- dination (g)? Indeed, rium (Cypria- nat) etiam

Episcopus Carthaginienſis conſtitutus eſt. Hieron. Catal.

(f) Cyprianus primum Rhetor, deinde Presbyter ad extremum Carthaginienſis Episcopus, Martyrio coronatur. Euseb. Chron. ad An. 259. And Marcus Aurelius Cassiodo- rus in his Chronicon transcribes the same very Words.

(g) See, Principles of the Cyprianic Age, p. 13, 14.

WHOSO shall attentively read *Pontius's* Account of the § XLIV. Life of St. *Cyprian*, shall be obliged in all Reason to acknow- ledge, that *Pontius* meant no less, than that St. *Cyprian* was first rais'd to the Degree of a *Priest*, and thereafter to the Degree of a *Bishop*. Which, if it can be made to appear, may oblige G. K. to consider, whether he was not a little rash, when he said; that by *Pontius's* Account, *Cyprian* was made *Priest*, *Presbyter* and *Bishop* all at once: That I may put this matter beyond all future Controversie; take *Pontius's* Account by these Steps.

I. PONTIUS fairly represents St. *Cyprian*, as having § XLV. first been a *Deacon*, before he was either *Presbyter* or *Bi- shop*. While he was ONE OF US (says he) he had an In- timacy with *Cæcilius*, an excellent Person, who, was then, both by Age and by Honour, a *Presbyter* (b) while he was ONE OF US, that is while he was a *Deacon*, as I take it, for such was *Pontius*: And this Gloss seems to be put beyond all Question, by that which forthwith follows, about the Respect and Deference, which our Martyr did then pay to that Venerable *Presbyter* (i). (b) Erat sane illi (Cypriano) etiam D E N O B I S Contuberniū viri iusti & laudabilis

Memoriæ, Cæcili & Ætate tunc & Honore Presbyteri. Pont. vit. Cyp. p. 3.

(i) Hunc toto Honore atque omni observantia diligebat obsequenti veneratione suspiciens.—ibid.

2. HE raises him to the *Presbyterate*, and that in such § XLVI. Terms as clearly import, that he was afterward raised to (k) Multa sunt an *Higher Dignity* (k): And he gives a particular Account quæ adhuc Plebeius, mul- ta quæ jam Presbyter fe- how his Behaviour while he was a *Presbyter*: How he con- temn'd the World; how all were welcome to his House; how charitable he was; how humble; how compassionate; how diligent, &c. (l) And then, cit. p. 2.

(l) Contentus dispendio rel familiaris Domus ejus patuit cuicunque Venienti. Nulla vidua reversa est sinu vacuo: Nullus indigens lumine non illo comite directus est: Nullus debilis gressu non illo ba- lo verus est: Nullus nudus auxilio de potentioris manu non illo tutore protectus est. p. 3.

3. He

§ XLVII.

3. He makes him a *Bishop*, and that with so many notorious peculiarities; with so many notable differences, to distinguish the *Degree* of a *Bishop*, from that of a *Presbyter*, that nothing seems to me more marvellous, than that some learned Men, who without question, had read and considered what *Pontius* has written, should yet have had the confidence to cite him, as making the *Presbyterate* and the *Episcopate* all one *Degree*. Take as many as may justify this my Assertion, in the following Train. And,

§ XLVII.

I. HAVING accounted for his Behaviour while a *Presbyter* and a *Deacon*, and coming to account how he was made a *Bishop*; he has this remarkable Transition: *It would be tedious to go through his Excellencies one by one: It would be troublesome to enumerate all his holy performances: This alone, I judge proof enough of his good Works, that by the determination of God, and the Favour of the people, he was chosen to the Office of the Priesthood, and the Degree of a Bishop*, (which two Phrases in the Language of those times do both signify one thing, and the one is only *Exegetick* of the other) while he was but a *Novice*, and, as some thought, an *unexperienced Christian* (m). What can be clearer than that this Transition is an handsome Address to the Account of his Promotion to the *Chair Episcopal*? But this is not all; For,

(m) Longum est ire per singula: Sancta ejus facta onerosum est enumerare.

Ad probationem bonorum operum, solum hoc arbitror satis esse quod JUDICIO DEI & Plebis ad favore ad OFFICIUM SACERDOTII & EPISCOPATUS GRADUM adhuc Neophytus, & ut putabatur, Novellus electus est. p. 3.

§ XLIX.

(n) Cap. VII.
§ XXXVIII.

2. PONTIUS, as I remember I have already accounted (n), gives a full Account of the zealous Inclinations, and the affectional Eagerness of the People, to have him their *Bishop*: How they manifested an Earnestness for it, that look'd like the effect of *divine Inspiration*: How, when they hear'd that he had resolv'd to retire, and refuse to be made *Bishop*, they besieg'd the doors of his House, and guard-ed all the Avenues; How Anxious they were to find him (o): Was this like the concern of the People, about having one to be a *Presbyter* of the City of *Carthage*? Is there any such Account in all Antiquity, of the Peoples Anxiety, to have one rais'd to the *degree* of a *simple Presbyter*? But neither is this all: For,

(o) Vide Cap. VII.

§ XXXVIII.

3. PON-

3. PONTIUS records it as a thing very remarkable, § L (and nothing ~~more remarkable~~ for our present purpose) that when he was thus, both design'd and desir'd by the People; yet he retired and lurked, as hath been already intimated, and that for this reason, *that he was willing to yield the preferment to such as were more ancient Presbyters* (p): And 4. That some of those who were more Ancient Presbyters did what they could to hinder his Promotion to the Bishoprick. These two laid together make up such a Demonstration (as I take it) of Pontius's distinguishing between St. Cyprian's preferment first to be a Presbyter, and after that to be a Bishop, that I am confident no man of Candour can resist its Evidence, when it is fully represented. I shall do it as briefly as I can, by laying together what both Pontius and our Martyr himself have told us about it. *Tho' I am unwilling* (says Pontius) *to tell it, yet tell it I must.* Some did resist his Promotion, tho' he overcame them. With what Lenity, with what Patience, with what Cheerfulness, with what Clemency did he pardon them? How generously, how much to the admiration of many, did he afterwards admit them to his friendship? And allow them a place amongst his Intimates? What a Miracle was it, that he who had so quick a Memory, should yet so quickly have forgot such Opposition (q)? So Pontius. Let us next hear St. Cyprian himself in his 43d. Epistle written to his People, when Felicissimus and the Five Presbyters made the Separation. The Malignity and Perfidiousness of some Presbyters (says he) hath made it impracticable for me to come to you before Easter: Which Presbyters, mindful of their Conspiracy, and retaining their ancient Venom against my Promotion to the Bishoprick, nay, against your Suffrage, and the Divine Judgement, do reinforce their old Attempts against me, and do again set on foot their sacrilegious Devices, with their accustomed Subtilties. And now, indeed, Divine Providence so ordering it, tho' I neither willed nor wished it; nay, tho' I pardon'd them and held my Peace, they have incurred the punishment which they have merited: Tho' they were not excommunicated by me, they have willfully excommunicated themselves, &c. (r). And again, in that same Epistle, the Age or Se-

(p) Non preteribo etiam illud eximium—humiliter ille secessit ANTIQUORIBUS CEDENS. p. 3.

(q) Invitus dico, sed dicam necesse est. Quidam illi resistunt etiam ut vinceret. Quibus tamen quanta lenitate, quam patienter, quam benevolenter indulsit, quam clementer ignoravit, amicissimos eos postmodum & inter necessarios computans, Mirantibus multis? cui enim posset non esse miraculo tam Memoriosæ mentis oblivio? p. 34.

(r) Hoc enim quorundam Presbyterorum Malignitas & perfidia perfecit, ne ad vos ante diem Paschæ venire licuisset, dum Conjuracionis suæ Memores & antiqua illa contra Episcopatum meum, imo contra Suffragium vestrum & Dei Judicium, venena retinentes, instaurant veterem contra nos impugnacionem suam, & sacrileges Machinationes insiliis solitis denuo revocant. Et quidem de Dei Providentia nobis hoc

nec Volentibus, nec Optantibus, *nor their* **AUTHORITY** *deceive you* (says he to his People): *They do but act over again the Wickedness of the two Elders against* Susannah, &c. Now,

pœnas quas meruerant rependerunt, ut à nobis non ejecti ultro se ejicerent, ipsi in se pro Conscientia sua sententiam darent, secundum vestra & Divina Suffragia, Conjurati & Scelerati de Ecclesia sponte se pellerent. Ep. 43. p. 81, 82. & rursum ibid. p. 83. Ne ÆTAS vos eorum nec AUCTORITAS fallat; qui ad duorum Presbyterorum veterem Nequitiam respondentes sicut illi Susannam pudicam corrumpere & violare conati sunt sic & hi adulterinis doctrinis Ecclesiæ pudicitiam corrumpere & veritatem Evangelicam violare conantur,

§ LI.

LAY these things together: What can be plainer than that the *Antiquiores*, to whom he was willing to have yielded the Preference, were *Ancienter Presbyters*? What plainer, by necessary consequence, than that the Promotion he was willing to have declined, and which those *Presbyters* opposed, was a *Higher One* than the *Presbyterate*? What plainer than that it galled them, that he who probably was the youngest, of all the *Presbyters* of *Carthage*, had been but some few months in that Station, should have been preferred to themselves, who had been *Presbyters* (some of them at least) so very long before him? How could either he have been willing, to yield the *Preference* to them, or they angry that he should have been *preferred*, if the *Preferment* was to no *Higher Station* than that of a *Presbyter*? If it was only a *Preferment* they were before in possession of? A Dignity wherein, they could not but have the *Preference* of him, by their very being preferred to it before him? Nay, what plainer, than that St. *Cyprian* was *preferred* to a *Degree* which cloath'd him with a *Power* whereby he might have *punish'd* them? *punish'd* them with the *highest Ecclesiastical Punishment*, *Excommunication* it self, had he had a mind for it? A *Power* which his very being cloath'd with, made his *Clemency* so conspicuous in forbearing to punish them for the Oppositions they made to his *Preferment* to it, when he might have done it? How could he have been cloath'd with a *Power* so visibly *Sovereign* as that is which has the Dispensation of *Punishments* and *Pardons*, even with regard to *Presbyters*, if he was rais'd to no *Higher Power* than that of a *single Presbyter*? Would they not, in that Case, have stood on a *Level* with him? How then could he have had any *power* at all

all over them? Especially, how could it have been consistent with the principles of *Presbyterian Government*, that *One Presbyter* and he the *Younger* too, should have been allowed a *Power*, to *Excommunicate Five Presbyters*, each of them *Ancienter* than himself; *Five Presbyters* probably making the *Major part* of the *Presbytery*? A thousand such Questions might be asked. But even these, I doubt, shall be hard enough for *G. R.*, or any of his Brethren. Let me advance to another step,

5. PONTIUS having thus undeniably rais'd our Martyr from the *Degree* of a *Presbyter*, to that of a *Bishop*, most remarkably begins thence, as from a new *Ara*: *Exinde quemadmodum se gesserit, quis referre sufficiat?* that is, in effect, *St. Cyprian* behaved himself so wonderfully after he was made *Bishop*, that it is not easie to write his *Encomium*. However, *Pontius* goes on to give a brief account of him, and of his way, quite different from what he gave of him before, while he was a *Presbyter*. Now it is, *Qua illi Pietas? qui Vigor? Misericordia, quanta? quanta Censura?* That is, *How admirable was his Paternal Affection, his Vigour, his Clemency, his Discipline* (s)? But I am not able to translate to the life, the pretty account *Pontius* gives of his Mien, his Way, his Garb, every thing about him after he was made *Bishop*, take it therefore in his own words on the Margent (t): In short,

ret intuentium mentes. Gravis vultus & Latus: Nec severitas tristis, nec comitas nimia, sed admixta utrinque temperies; ut esset ambigere, vereri plus an diligi mereretur, nisi quod & vereri & diligi merebatur. Sed nec cultus fuit Dispar à Vultu, temperatus & ipse de Medio. Non illum Superbia Secularis inflaverat: Nec tamen prorsus affectata penuria sordiderat; quia & hoc vestitus genus à jactantia minus non est, quam Ostenta taliter ambitiosa fragalitas. Quid autem circa Pauperes EPISCOPUS faceret quos Catechumenus diligebat, viderint Pietatis Antistites seu quos ad Officium boni Operis instruxit ipsius Ordinis disciplina, seu quos Sacramenti Religio Communis ad Obsequium exhibendæ dilectionis artavit. Cyprianum de suo talem accepit CATHEDRA, non fecit, p. 4.

6. PONTIUS accounts particularly, 1. How, as a *Bishop*, and making such a *Figure*, he was proscribed (u). 2. How God had a singular care of him, to preserve him as an Instrument that was to do many excellent Services to the Church; by his Writings; by his prudent Advices; by his singular Example; by his well pois'd Discipline, &c (v). by his Zeal for Unity (w), and his many other excellent Accomplishments. 3. How careful he was, while *Bishop*,

shop, about *Ecclesiastical Promotions*, receiving none into *holy Orders*, but *fit and worthy Persons* (x). 4. How as Bishop, he was the second time *banish'd* (y). 5. How, by the special Providence of God, his Martyrdom was delayed, till he, as Bishop, might put the Affairs of his Church in good Order (z). 6. How Providence order'd, that just before his last Tryal, he should have the Honour of a Bishop in the very *Prætorium* (a). 7. How he was sentenced as a Bishop (b). And in fine. 8. How he was *Executed* as a Bishop (c). And now, by this time, methinks, the Reader may judge, whether *Pontius* look'd on the *Presbyteratus* and the *Episcopatus* as the same Degree: Whether, by his Account, *St. Cyprian* was made *Priest*, *Presbyter* and *Bishop*, all at once, as being the same thing: As *G. R.* would have it.

(x) Distributa sunt ergo continuo pro qualitate hominum atque Ordinum Ministeria. p. 6.
 (y) p. 6.
 (z) Quæ vero res illi aut quæ Voluntas Ordinanda, nisi Ecclesiastici status? Suprema i. c. dilatio est, ut quicquid, circa Pauperum fovendorum curam, supremo iudicio disponendum fuerat, ordinaretur.

(a) Sedile autem erat fortuito linteo tectum ut & sub lectu passionis EPISCOPATUS HONORE frueretur. p. 9.

(b) Legit itaque de tabula jam Sententiam Iudex — Sententiam Spiritalem, non temere dicendam; Sententiam EPISCOPO tali & tali teste condignam; Sententiam Gloriosam in qua dictus est Sæctæ SIGNIFER, &c. p. 9.

(c) — O beatum Ecclesiæ Populum qui EPISCOPO SUO tali & oculis pariter & sensibus, & quod est amplius, publicata voce compassus est. — p. 10.

§. LIV. IT remains now, that we enquire, whether *Pontius* (as the rest of his Contemporaries) believed *Episcopacy* to be of *Divine Right*? An Enquiry capable of a very easie Discussion: For who can imagine (tho' we had no more) that *Pontius* the *Deacon* did not believe as *St. Cyprian* his beloved Bishop believed? But we have much more. For *Pontius*, having rais'd him to the *Episcopal Chair*, always bestows such *Names* and *Epithets* upon him, as may very securely perswade us of his *Belief* in the matter: He calls him *Christi* & *Dei Pontifex*: *Ille Dei Pontifex*: *Sacerdos Dei*: *Antistes Dei*: *Christi* & *Dei Princeps*. *God's Bishop*; that *Bishop of God*; *God's Priest*; *God's Prelate*; *God and his Christ's Prince*, &c. He expressly says, he was chosen *Dei iudicio*, by *God's special Designation*. That it was *Adspirante Domino*, by *Divine Inspiration*, that the People were so earnest to have him their Bishop: And that it was *Divinitatis Prasagium*, that they were so desirous of him. He gives an Account of divers *Extraordinary Revelations* God honoured him, as a Bishop, with; as when he commanded him to retire in the time of the *Decian Persecution* (d). And represented to him by a *Vision*, not only the general

(d) p. 5.

neral Scheme, but most of the particular circumstances of his Martyrdom (e). He says, he served God intirely; which (e) p. 7. fusc. how could he have done, if he had *usurped* an *unlawful Station*, an *unwarranted Office*, an *Ecclesiastical Tyranny*, a *Church Domination*, &c. Not only *without* but *against* Divine Authority? He says, it was the way to please God the Father, and Christ our Judge, to be subject to him (f). He accounts, how God peculiarly befriended him, in providing a pleasant Retreat for him in the days of his *Proscription*: How God preserv'd him and protected him as a singularly useful Member of his Church. He says, that as a *Bishop*, he was made a *Sacrifice well-pleasing to God* by his Martyrdom (g): that there was a special hand of *Divine Favour* in the whole Conduct of it: Nay that the very *Sentence* (like *Caiphas* his Prophecy concerning our Saviour) though pronounced by a wicked Person, was of *Divine Inspiration* (h). All these fair Evidences (and many more) *Pontius* gives us, of his *Firm Belief* of the *Divine Approbation* of *Episcopacy*: And G. R. I hope, will not deny but the Consequence is just, from the *Belief* of *Divine Approbation*, to the *Belief* of *Divine Institution*. To conclude, *Pontius* (as hath been observed before) did plainly believe, that *Bishops succeeded to the Apostles*; and that there had always (since the very founding of it) been *Bishops* in the Church of *Carthage*, in a constant & regular *Succession* to the *Apostles*; and he expressly calls the *Episcopal Office* an *Heavenly Priesthood*, which can import nothing more naturally, than that it had an *Heavenly Original*. Nothing plainer than all this, from his own words, as you have them on the Margent (i), and so much about *Pontius*.

Omnia quippe quæ dicta sunt, licet à Gentili dicta, DIVINA sunt. p. 10.
(i) Sic consummata passione perfectum est, ut Cyprianus, qui bonorum omnium fuerat Exemplum etiam SACERDOTALES. (i. e. Episcopales) Coronas in Africa primus imbueret, quia & talis esse POST APOSTOLOS prior cæperat, ex quo enim Carthaginæ EPISCOPATUS ORDO NUMERATUR, nunquam aliquis, quamvis ex bonis & Sacerdotibus, ad Passionem venisse Memoratur; licet semper Deo Mancipata Devotio, dicatis hominibus pro Martyrio deputeretur: Cyprianus tamen etiam ad perfectam Coronam Domino consummante profecit, ut in Civitate ipsa in qua taliter vixerat & in qua prior fecerat multa præclara, prior etiam SACERDOTII COELESTIS insignia glorioso cruore decoraret. p. 10.

THUS I have represented the Belief of St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries, as to the Divine Right of Episcopacy. The Number of Depositions, that this Divine Right was then universally believed, is very great: It was the Belief of all the

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

Bishops, and by good Consequence (all things considered) of all the Christians in *Africa*. It was the Belief of Bishops, Clergy and People of *Rome*; the best Evidence can be expected of the *Common Faith* of the *European*; of *Dionysius* and *Origen*, two unexceptionable Witnesses of the *Faith* of the *Egyptian*; and of *Alexander* and *Firmilian*, every way as famous Witnesses of the *Belief* of the *Eastern* or *Asiatick Churches*. It was indeed the *Belief* of all Persons of all Orders, Degrees, Ranks, and Qualities. Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Inferior Ministers, Martyrs, Confessors, Persevering Christians, Perfidious Lapsers, Orthodox Believers, Hereticks, Catholics, Schismatics, Clergy, Laicks, Learned, Unlearned, &c. Not so much as one Testimony in the Monuments of that Age to the contrary: No Article of the Christian Faith, more Unanimously, more Incontestedly, more Universally received. I will be bold to challenge *G. R.* or any Presbyterian in *Scotland*, to produce one Witness, of whatsoever Quality, I shall not say formally deposing, but probably insinuating, that *Prelacy* was an *Human Invention*: an Office introduced into the Church after the Days, or by a lesser Authority than that of the *Apostles*.

§ LVI.

SHALL I add another Consideration, of no small Weight in this matter? 'Tis this: No Age of the Church, assignable, wherein Christians closer Adherents to *Divine Authority*, or stricter Observers of *Divine Institutions*; or nicer Requirers of *Divine Warrant*, for every thing proposed to be received by them. Never Age, wherein *Innovations* more carefully guarded against; or *Human Inventions* more zealously rejected; or *Recessions* from *Divine Appointments* more religiously remonstrated against or repudiated. On all Occasions and in all Controversies, our Blessed Martyr *St. Cyprian* (therein imitated by all his Contemporaries, *Stephen* himself not excepted) recurs to *Divine Authority*, requires *Divine Precept* or *Warrant*; rejects whatever is without it. He reprobates with Keeness and heights of Indignation, the *Plea of Custom*, in every Case wherein a *Command* cannot be produced. Indeed, he doth not allow them to be *Christians* who forsake *Christs Institutions*, and in their stead set up their own *Contrivances*. I might easily fill some sheets with Testimonies to this purpose: Nor was it peculiar to him to be so nice and cautious in this matter: Not one of his Contemporaries otherwise minded. This I say, might
be

be largely insisted on and most fully proved: But 'tis need-
le's: Not a Page almost in the Monuments of those times
but affords copious Evidence.

ONLY one thing, therefore, I shall instance in. It is § LVII.
that which is our present Concernment, the Government
of the Church: St. Cyprian is not more peremptory about
any one thing, than that there ought to be no *Recession*
from *Divine Ordinance* and *Institution*, either in the *Consti-
tution* or the *Practice* of it. This is the great Argument he
uses with his People, to oblige them to desert and disown
Felicitissimus and his *Complices*; viz. that that *Schismatical*
party was acting plainly contrary to *God's Ordinance*, in stir-
ring up the *Martyrs* and *Confessors*, and the *Lapsers* against
the *Bishop* (k): And that for that Party to *absolve* the *Lap-
sers without the Bishop*, was a new *Tradition of sacrilegious In-
stitution*, set up against the *Evangelical Discipline* (l): That
therefore, his People ought *courageously* and *resolvedly* to re-
ject the Party, and carefully abstain from all *Communication*
with it (m). This same is likewise his great Argument
against the *Roman Schismatics*; those who did set up *No-
vatianus* an *Anti-bishop* against the *One true Bishop*: He says
to do so, was *contrary to the Evangelical Law*; and by Con-
sequence, to set up *Another*, that it is not a Christian, but an
Antichristian Church (n). Or, as he elsewhere words it,
a *Human Church*, a Church of *Man's Invention* (o). So plain
and peremptory was St. Cyprian against all *Innovations*, even
in the point of *Government*: So careful was he to keep by
Divine Institution.

(k) Hic fomenta
olim quibus-
dam confes-
soribus &
hortamenta
tribuebant, ne
concordarent
cum EPIS-
COPIS suis,
nec Ecclesia-
sticam Disci-
plinam cum
fide & quiete
juxta P R A-
E P T A
DOMINICA
continere-
Acne parum

fuisse corruptis quorundam Confessorum mentes, & contra SACERDOTIUM DEI
portionem ruptæ fraternitatis armare—Ep. 43. p. 82.

(l) Eadem nunc ratio, eadem rursus eversio per quinque Presbyteros Felicissimo
Copulatos, ad ruinam Salutis inducitur, ut non rogetur Deus, nec qui negavit Chri-
stum, eundem Christum quem negaverat deprecetur, post culpam criminis tollatur
& Pœnitentia; nec per EPISCOPOS & Sacerdotes Domino satisfiat; sed relictis
DOMINI SACERDOTIBUS, CONTRA EVANGELICAM DISCIPLINAM
NOVA TRADITIO SACRILEGÆ INSTITUTIONIS EXURGAT. Ibid.

(m) Nemo vos, fratres, errare à Domini viis faciat: Nemo vos Christianos ab Evan-
gelio Christi rapiat. Nemo filios Ecclesiæ de Ecclesia tollat. Pereant sibi soli qui perire
voluerunt. Extra Ecclesiam soli remaneant qui de Ecclesia recesserunt. Soli cum Epis-
copis non sint qui contra Episcopos rebellant. Conjuratiōis sue poenas soli subeant,
qui olim secundum vestra suffragia, nunc secundum Dei Judicia Sententiam Conju-
ratiōis & Malignitatis sue subire meruerunt. Monet nos Dominus in Evangelio suo
dicens, Rejicitis Mandatum Domini & TRADITIONEM vestram statuat. Qui

MAN-

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entitled,

Bishops, and by good Consequence (all things considered) of all the Christians in *Africa*. It was the Belief of Bishops, Clergy and People of *Rome*; the best Evidence can be expected of the *Common Faith* of the *European*; of *Dionysius* and *Origen*, two unexceptionable Witnesses of the *Faith* of the *Egyptian*; and of *Alexander* and *Firmilian*, every way as famous Witnesses of the *Belief* of the *Eastern* or *Asiatick Churches*. It was indeed the *Belief* of all Persons of all Orders, Degrees, Ranks, and Qualities. Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Inferior Ministers, Martyrs, Confessors, Persevering Christians, Perfidious Lapsers, Orthodox Believers, Hereticks, Catholics, Schismatics, Clergy, Laicks, Learned, Unlearned, &c. Not so much as one Testimony in the Monuments of that Age to the contrary: No Article of the Christian Faith, more Unanimously, more Incontestedly, more Universally received. I will be bold to challenge *G. R.* or any Presbyterian in *Scotland*, to produce one Witness, of whatsoever Quality, I shall not say formally deposing, but probably insinuating, that *Prelacy* was an *Human Invention*: an Office introduced into the Church after the Days, or by a lesser Authority than that of the *Apostles*.

§ LVI.

SHALL I add another Consideration, of no small Weight in this matter? 'Tis this: No Age of the Church, assignable, wherein Christians closer Adherents to *Divine Authority*, or stricter Observers of *Divine Institutions*, or nicer Requirers of *Divine Warrant*, for every thing proposed to be received by them. Never Age, wherein *Innovations* more carefully guarded against; or *Human Inventions* more zealously rejected; or *Recessions* from *Divine Appointments* more religiously remonstrated against or repudiated. On all Occasions and in all Controversies, our Blessed Martyr *St. Cyprian* (therein imitated by all his Contemporaries, *Stephen* himself not excepted) recurs to *Divine Authority*, requires *Divine Precept* or *Warrant*; rejects whatever is without it. He reprobates with Keeness and heights of Indignation, the *Plea of Custom*, in every Case wherein a *Command* cannot be produced. Indeed, he doth not allow them to be *Christians* who forsake *Christs Institutions*, and in their stead set up their own *Contrivances*. I might easily fill some sheets with Testimonies to this purpose: Nor was it peculiar to him to be so nice and cautious in this matter: Not one of his Contemporaries otherwise minded. This I say, might
be

be largely insisted on and most fully proved: But 'tis needless: Not a Page almost in the Monuments of those times but affords copious Evidence.

ONLY one thing, therefore, I shall instance in. It is § LVII. that which is our present Concernment, the Government of the Church: St. Cyprian is not more peremptory about any one thing, than that there ought to be no *Recession* from *Divine Ordinance* and *Institution*, either in the *Constitution* or the *Practice* of it. This is the great Argument he uses with his People, to oblige them to desert and disown *Felicitissimus* and his *Complices*; viz. that that *Schismatical party* was acting plainly contrary to God's *Ordinance*, in stirring up the *Martyrs* and *Confessors*, and the *Lapsers* against the *Bishop* (k): And that for that Party to *absolve* the *Lapsers* without the *Bishop*, was a new *Tradition* of *sacrilegious Institution*, set up against the *Evangelical Discipline* (l); That therefore, his People ought *courageously* and *resolvedly* to *reject* the *Party*, and carefully abstain from *all Communication* with it (m). This same is likewise his great Argument against the *Roman Schismatics*; those who did set up *Novatianus* an *Anti-bishop* against the *One true Bishop*: He says to do so, was *contrary to the Evangelical Law*; and by Consequence, to set up *Another*, that it is not a *Christian*, but an *Antichristian Church* (n). Or, as he elsewhere words it, a *Human Church*, a *Church of Man's Invention* (o). So plain and peremptory was St. Cyprian against all *Innovations*, even in the point of *Government*: So careful was he to keep by *Divine Institution*.

(k) Hifomenta olim quibusdam confessoribus & hortamenta tribuebant, ne concordarent cum EPIS. COPO suo, nec Ecclesiasticam Disciplinam cum fide & quiete juxta P R Æ. C E P T A DOMINICA continerent-- Acne parum

fuiſſet corrupiſſe quorundam Confessorum mentes, & contra SACERDOTIUM DEI portionem ruptæ fraternitatis armare—Ep 43. p. 82.

(l) Eadem nunc ratio, eadem rursus everſio per quinque Presbyteros Felicissimo Copulatos, ad ruinam Salutis inducitur, ut non rogetur Deus, nec qui negavit Christum, eundem Christum quem negaverat deprecetur, post culpam criminis tollatur & Pœnitentia; nec per EPISCOPOS & Sacerdotes Domino satisfiat; sed relictis DOMINI SACERDOTIBUS, CONTRA EVANGELICAM DISCIPLINAM NOVA TRADITIO SACRILEGÆ INSTITUTIONIS EXURGAT. Ibid.

(m) Nemo vos, fratres, errare à Domini viis faciat: Nemo vos Christianos ab Evangelio Christi rapiat. Nemo filios Ecclesiæ de Ecclesia tollat. Pereant sibi soli qui perire voluerunt. Extra Ecclesiam soli remaneant qui de Ecclesia recesserunt. Soli cum Episcopis non sint qui contra Episcopos rebellaverunt. Conjuratiōis sue pœnas soli subeant, qui olim secundum vestra suffragia, nunc secundum Dei Judicia Sententiam Conjuratiōis & Malignitatis sue subire meruerunt. Monet nos Dominus in Evangelio suo dicens, Rejicitis Mandatum Domini & TRADITIONEM vestram statuat. Qui

MAN-

MANDATUM DEI rejiciunt & TRADITIONEM SUAM STATUERE CONANTUR. FORTITER à VOBIS & FIRMITER RESPUANTUR. *Ep. 42. p. 84.*

(n) Gravatus enim me atque contristatus, & intolerabilis percussus & pene prostratus pectoris molestia perstringit cum vos illic (*Romæ. Nam Romanos Schismaticos alloquitur*) comperissem contra Ecclesiasticam Dispositionem CONTRA EVANGELICAM LEGEM, contra institutionis Catholicæ Unitatem ALIUM EPISCOPUM fieri consensisse, id est, quod nec Fas est, nec licet fieri, ECCLESIAM ALIAM consuturi, &c. *Ep. 46. p. 89.*

(o) Quisquis ille est, & qualiscunque est Christianus non est qui in Ecclesia Christi non est: Jactet se licet (*Novatianus*) & Philosophiam vel Eloquentiam suam superbis vocibus prædicet; qui nec fraternam caritatem, nec Ecclesiasticam Unitatem retinuit, etiam quod prius fuerat, amisit. Nisi si tibi Episcopus videtur qui Episcopo in Ecclesia à sedecim Coepiscopis facto, ADULTER atque EXTRANEUS EPISCOPUS fieri à Desertoribus per anibitum nititur, ut cum sit A CHRISTO una Ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item EPISCOPATUS UNUS (*ab eodem nempe Christo*) Episcoporum multorum concordia Numerositate diffusus; ille POST DEI TRADITIONEM—HUMANAM CONETUR ECCLESIAM FACERE, &c. *Ep. 55. p. 112.*

§ LVIII.

I INTENDED no more than what I have done, viz. To name this great Consideration, which might have been pursued to a very great Length. But the Hint I have given is sufficient for my purpose. Let us therefore, in a word, cast up the *Summ* of this *Discourse*. Here it is. I have fully shewn, that there was proper *Prelacy* in St. Cyprian's time, and that all the world over: Not only a *Prelacy* of *Dignity*, but also a *Prelacy* of *Power*; a notorious *Episcopal Superiority* over *Presbyters*, lodg'd in the Persons of Bishops (p). I have shewn, that those of the Cyprianick Age, lived at no such distance from the days of the Apostles, but that they might have had most certain knowledge, most full assurance, of what Form of Government, the Apostles left in those Churches, whose Constitution they lived to finish (q). I have shewn, that they did universally believe, and with the greatest assurance profess it as an unquestionable point of their Faith, that the *Episcopacy* which obtain'd and was practis'd in their time; that is, that a *proper Episcopacy*, as above described, was not only of *Divine Approbation*, but of *Divine Institution*; A *Divine Ordinance* as properly as any other whatsoever: I have shewn, I say, that this was an Article in that Age universally received: And I dare renew my Charge, and challenge G. R. or any of his Fraternity to shew me so much as one Witness, that lived in that Age, either *deposing* against the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*; or *debating* it; or *doubting* of it.

(p) CAP. V. VI
VII.

(q) CAP. I.
§ XXXV. &c.

I have just now shewn, that those who did, in that Age, so peremptorily *depose* for the *Divine Right* of it, did it not carelessly, or indeliberately, or upon untryed or unexamined Principles. I have shewn, that never Men were more *nice* in their *Belief*; never Men more *cautious* against taking things upon *trust*, and without serious *Penetration* and *Enquiry*; never Men more *averse* to admit *Innovations*, or swallow down *human Inventions*. If any Men shall think I have not sufficiently established this last Step, let him tell me so much, and hereby I do promise him satisfaction. Till I am told so much, I will think I have sufficiently established it. I am confident, no Man acquainted with the Monuments of that Age, can call this last Step in Question. Now, what is the Result? In short,

IF these things are sufficiently established, then, let our § LIX.
Presbyterian Brethren, and all other *Sectarians*, who reject *Episcopal Government*, consider what a *Presumption*, or rather, what a *Demonstration* the *universal Faith* and *Practise* of the *Cyprianick Age* is against them. Let all *Latitudinarians*, all those who are for the *Indifferency* of *Episcopal Government* look to it, and weigh their Arguments for it over again. Let them joyn them all together, and put them in the Balance, with the *Principles* and the *universal Belief* of the *Christians* of the *Cyprianick Age*; and ingenuously confess, that all things considered, they are very *light* and of very *little Moment*. Let those who are bold to *separate* from Churches *Episcopally constituted*, because they are of *such a Constitution*, look to it. Let those who condemn, who revile, who undervalue, who rebel against *Orthodox*, *Holy*, *Catholic*, *Canonically ordained*, and *Lawfully promoted Bishops*, look to it. Let them look to it who can adventure, for serving *Carnal Ends*, for securing little *Temporal Interests*, in pursuance of unaccountable *Humours*, or, which is little better, in *Subserviency* to worldly *Politicks*, overturn the *Episcopal Constitution* of Churches, and persecute *Bishops*. Let them seriously consider, if it be a *light Matter*, to make so bold with such sacred Interests: And let all those who suffer for their *Adherence* to *Episcopacy*, consider, with what *Comfort* they may do it, and with what *Constancy* they ought to do it. What greater *Comfort*, what greater *Encouragement*, can we readily imagine, than there must be, in *adhering*
to

A Vindication of a Discourse, Entituled,

to Principles so universally received, so firmly believed, so religiously adhered to, in such a Glorious Age? so long as we adhere to them, we do really live in Communion with the Saints of that Age. And if we adorn our Profession with a suitable Practice, we may be fully assured, that we live in Communion with the same God and the same Saviour they lived in Communion with. And by consequence, when we suffer for our Adherence to such Principles, we may be fully assured, that we suffer in a good Cause, for the sake of Righteousness; for the Testimony of a good Conscience: That we suffer in such a Cause as ought to animate us, and inspire us with true Christian Courage, and Resolution to suffer patiently and perseveringly, till God of his infinite Mercy, shall here or hereafter put an End to our Sufferings.

26 JU 57

 F I N I S.
